DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 309 787 IR 052 882

AUTHOR Harloe, Bart, Ed.
TITLE Towards the Year 2001: Cooperative Collection Development and Resource Sharing in the Southwest. Proceedings of a Workshop (Las Cruces, New Mexico, November 7, 1988).
INSTITUTION New Mexico State Univ., Las Cruces. Univ. Libraries.
PUB DATE 7 Nov 88
NOTE 56p.
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Libraries; Futures (of Society); Higher Education; *Library Collection Development; *Library Cooperation; *Shared Library Resources; Workshops
IDENTIFIERS United States (Southwest)

ABSTRACT

These proceedings of a workshop on cooperative collection development and resource sharing in the Southwest contains the text of the following presentations: (1) "Collaborative Collection Development in an Era of Financial Limitations" (Paul Mosher); (2) "Cooperative Collection Development: The New Mexico Point of View" (Jeanne Sohn); (3) "Collection Development Policies and the Arizona Experience" (Dora Biblarz); (4) "Technical Aspects of Cooperative Collection Development" (Sara Heitshu); and (5) "Trans-Border Cooperation and the Texas Experience" (Mary Keckley). A transcription of workshop discussion by the presenters and audience members is included as well as biographical information on the presenters. A directory of workshop participants is appended. (MES)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED309787

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

TOWARDS THE YEAR 2001:

Cooperative Collection Development and Resource Sharing in the Southwest

Proceedings of a Workshop Sponsored by the
New Mexico State University Library
November 7, 1988

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Bart Harloe
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Foreword by Dr. Hiram Davis
Dean of Libraries
New Mexico State University Library

Edited with an Introduction
by Bart Harloe
Head, Collection Management
New Mexico State University Library

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

IR052882

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword.....i

Introduction.....ii

Editorial Note.....iv

WORKSHOP.....1

About the Speakers.....2

Paul Mosher
"Collaborative Collection Development in an Era of Financial Limitations".....4

Jeanne Sohn
"Cooperative Collection Development: The New Mexico Point of View".....16

Dora Biblarz
"Collection Development Policies and the Arizona Experience".....20

Sara Heitshu
"Technical Aspects of Cooperative Collection Development".....23

Mary Keckley
"Trans-Border Cooperation and the Texas Experience".....26

WORKSHOP DISCUSSION.....29

Speaker Biographical Information.....42

Appendix A.....44

FOREWORD

. . . library cooperation, as championed by academic administrators, rarely, if ever, achieves the lofty objectives envisioned by those officials.

-Richard M. Dougherty

The imperative for change is constant in American higher education. However, reassessment and change notwithstanding, the 1980s have not provided higher education with a stable environment. During this period societal impacts continue to alter the very scope, character and operations of colleges and universities, and concomitantly their libraries. It is now generally predicted that the decade of the 1990s will be just as volatile.

Thus, academic libraries (same as their parent institutions) are in the midst of a quiet revolution which, in fact, is becoming less quiet. They are facing unprecedented changes and adjustments. This is being caused largely by budgetary constraints, the current crisis in scholarly publication, and new technological developments. Each of these have had a significant impact on library cooperation and resource sharing. For example, the continuing proliferation of information resources, combined with cost inflation for library materials, static and decreasing budgets, has long challenged the practicality of library-self-sufficiency. Therefore, library cooperation and resource sharing has moved from a fortuitous circumstance to a virtue of necessity.

As new technology dramatically enhances our capacity to collect, organize and analyze information resources of increasing magnitude and value, the challenge is to ensure the development of appropriate models/structures for enhancing learning, scholarship and access to needed information. To shape the information agenda for the 1990s and beyond, a new consensus is required within the library and academic community. It was for this purpose that the workshop on "Cooperative Collection Development and Resource Sharing in the Southwest" was sponsored by the NMSU Library.

The workshop provided a forum to examine some of the major issues related to networking, cooperative collection development and resource sharing, and to begin strategic planning for future cooperative programs. The keynote address presented by Dr. Paul Mosher provided an excellent overview of the conference theme. The papers presented by the speakers are insightful and should be of general interest. Together they provide a good look at the potential for mutual beneficial cooperative collection development and resource sharing in this region.

The effectiveness of academic libraries in the future will depend, in large measure, first on locally available solid programmatic core collections and second on strong collaborative networks built for coordinated collection development, resource sharing and information delivery. Academic libraries in the Southwest are well positioned to make that future a reality.

Hiram L. Davis, Dean
New Mexico State University Library

INTRODUCTION: "A Cooperative Neighborhood in the Southwest"

"The Americans, Westbound in the 19th Century to fulfill their vision of a just society for their countrymen with the aid of their `mechanic arts', made a cooperative neighborhood of their states."

-Paul Horgan
Great River: The Rio Grande in North American History*

As we rapidly approach the 21st century, it might be well to glance backwards in order to gain a historical perspective on our present situation. Paul Horgan's classic work, written almost a half-century ago, provides an appropriate context for a consideration of the issue of library cooperation. In the last chapter of Great River, entitled "Utility and Vision," Horgan described the progressive impact of the "mechanic arts" on the region, especially the way in which new technology finally connected the people of the Rio Grande to the rest of the United States. Horgan made a persuasive case for a positive view of the new communications media that brought to the region "a swift - often simultaneous - communication of images and ideas of experience that transcended the fixed limits of local traditions."

In 1988, librarians in New Mexico believed that the time was ripe to begin a serious exploration of the issue of library cooperation, to pursue the utility of the cooperative vision in New Mexico and its neighboring states. Consequently, over 70 librarians from New Mexico, Texas, and Arizona were invited to a workshop in Las Cruces.

Sponsored by the NMSU Library, the workshop featured speakers from academic and research libraries who had a wealth of direct experience with both the practical and theoretical aspects of resource sharing and cooperative collection development.

Paul Mosher, Vice-Provost and Director of Libraries at the University of Pennsylvania, provided the keynote address. Mosher argued that the notion of complete self-sufficiency for any academic library is a myth that needs to be overcome if we are to cope effectively with the information and research needs of our patrons in today's economic and technological environment. Mosher concluded with remarks directed toward the need to change attitudes by establishing a collaborative process in which cooperation becomes a kind of second nature, both for the individuals and the institutions involved.

*All quotes are from Vol. II, Chapter 43, pp. 940-944. (Austin, Texas: Texas Monthly Press, 1984, c1954)

Jeanne Sohn, Associate Dean of Library Service at UNM, candidly described some of the barriers to cooperation that have historically operated in New Mexico and then asked a provocative question: "Given these barriers, how can we possibly accomplish cooperation in New Mexico?" She answered her own question by citing examples of successful models in states that have similar demographic, economic, and geographic characteristics. She concluded with a call to heed the New Mexico Commission on Higher Education by implementing the recommendations contained in its 2005 report.

Next, two librarians from neighboring Arizona shared with the group some Arizona experiences with cooperative efforts between academic libraries. Dora Biblarz, Associate Dean for Collection Development at Arizona State University, made the case for written collection policy statements both as a guide for internal selection efforts and as a foundation for external cooperative efforts among academic libraries. Sara Heitshu, Assistant University Librarian for Technical Services at the University of Arizona, addressed some of the technical problems that would need to be solved in order to make efficient resource sharing a reality for academic libraries. She emphasized the need to create shared cataloging records and she also argued for the utility of serials union lists.

Mary Keckley, Associate University Librarian at the University of Texas at El Paso, focused her talks on two existing resource sharing arrangements: one that UTEP has organized with six academic libraries in Mexico and the other with New Mexico State University. The "South of the Border" program with Mexico is a pathbreaking experiment that requires overcoming unique international obstacles to cooperation. Keckley also described the recently developed program between UTEP and NMSU whereby improved reciprocal access to each institution's collections has been made available to faculty and graduate students.

Last, but certainly not least, the final hour of the workshop was a lively discussion between the audience and the speakers. Topics covered included the impact of automation on cooperative programs, the need for a reliable delivery service, the politics of cooperation in Arizona and New Mexico and the prospect for cooperation with special libraries in New Mexico especially as it relates to increased access to major scientific and technical collections. Underlying the entire discussion was the realization that the unique history and geography of the Southwest are factors that condition all efforts toward cooperation in the region.

It was this emerging realization, however, that reinforced the prevailing view among the workshop participants that it was now time for libraries in the Southwest to utilize their "mechanic arts" to pursue the vision of a "cooperative neighborhood of libraries" in the region. In so doing, the libraries would not only be fulfilling the tradition so ably described by Paul Horgan, but just as importantly, they would also be preparing to meet the information and resource needs of the people in this region well into the 21st century.

Bart Harloe
Las Cruces, New Mexico
March, 1989

Editorial Note: Except for Paul Mosher's keynote address, papers included in this publication were transcribed from the actual workshop presentations and then reworked for formal publication. For the most part, only minor editorial changes were made in the speakers' papers. Insofar as audience participation in the workshop discussion is concerned, every effort was made to accurately identify and record comments. In a few instances, the transcriptions were edited in order to maintain continuity and to avoid redundancy. Special thanks go to Patsy Hernandez, Collection Management Department, and Cheryl Wilson, Head of Special Collections at the NMSU Library, for their assistance on this project.

Towards the Year 2001: Cooperative Collection
Development and Resource Sharing in the Southwest

Good afternoon and welcome to our workshop on Cooperative Collection Development. I hope you all found this room very easily. My name is Bart Harloe, panel moderator. I sent you the letter inviting you to this meeting. I am glad to see you all here. I'd like to introduce, at this time, Hiram Davis who is Dean of the New Mexico State University Library.

Thanks, Bart. We are very pleased to have you here at Las Cruces on such a beautiful fall day. Do you all have leaf weather like this where you were? It is a great day here in the fall for New Mexico. You could be back east someplace where it's snowing. We're very delighted to have you with us at our first Annual Collection Development Conference. During this last year, New Mexico State University has just completed its centennial year. I understand that our sister institution up north is just beginning their celebration. There seems to be some misunderstanding about the dates here, but we won't get into that.

This is a very important time for us. It not only provides us an opportunity to reflect on our past, but, I think probably more importantly, it gives you an opportunity to think about the future and do some visioning. It seems that we are in a very unique place and time here in New Mexico. There are a couple of things that are occurring that are going to have a significant impact on academic libraries here in the state. I am sure that you've seen the document Planning for the Class of 2005: A Vision of the Future. If you've had the opportunity to read that, you will note that there is a very important statement in that document that speaks to academic libraries and the need for cooperation and resource sharing. I think that statement in that document provides some real emphasis for a recent event that took place three weeks ago at Northern New Mexico Community College. There were representatives of 17 academic libraries there and they ratified a constitution for creating the New Mexico Consortium for Academic Libraries. I think this is going to be a very important group in terms of future development for academic libraries in the state. Certainly, this workshop today provides another form of vision that we have, and we are very pleased to have you with us to help develop and shape that vision. We hope that you have a very enjoyable workshop and we are very pleased to have you with us. Thank you.

Bart Harloe - I want to cover a few of the mechanics of this program today. There is a sign-up sheet that is going to be passed around and, if you could, indicate your name and institution and also whether you are interested in a audio tape or this workshop. I know that some people couldn't be here and asked if they could have either a printed version or an audio tape of the workshop. So you have a choice, we are recording this and we will make the audiotapes available. A sign-up sheet is being passed around by Patsy Hernandez and John Freyermuth and will be picked up at the break. I'd like to thank Bette Fancher, Patsy Hernandez, and Cheryl Wilson for helping to organize this event. Many of you people know that when putting together these programs how complicated they get and the logistics were kind of interesting for this program. It is going to be a very informal session.

I know it looks formal on the paper, but we have really asked people to basically critique Paul Mosher's talk and to respond informally. We tried to make sure that there was very little duplication or overlap in terms of the points that they are going to be responding to. After the speakers have all done their thing, we are going to take a brief break. The floor is then going to be open for questions and answers and we really hope that you take that opportunity to participate. The point of this session is to generate some ideas and energy for new undertakings in New Mexico and this part of the southwest. I think it is a good time to put forward the pros and cons of cooperative collection development and resource sharing. So we will be looking for your participation during the last segment of this program. Finally, there will be a reception from 5:00 to 6:00 P.M poolside, as they say, and you are all invited to that. It should be a good time.

Now in terms of introducing this group, it is rather awesome. Collectively, if you look at their resumes, I counted up, (this is going to be a telling point) 80 years of collective experience that this panel has in the areas of collection management, acquisitions, serials management, and technical services; and that is quite impressive. Thirty-six years of that has been in the Southwest. We've let Paul in today. We gave him some points for adjacency because he spent so much time in California the last few years. He is the one person that is not from the Southwest. Let me introduce the people in the reverse order that they are going to be speaking and there is some biographical information in your packet. I am just going to be providing a few highlights.

Mary Keckley is from the University of Texas, El Paso. She is an Associate University Librarian at the University of Texas. She has had a long stint there where she has been a Library Automation Coordinator, Head of Serials Department and Head of the Cataloging Processing Section. Mary is going to be talking a bit about some of the things that are going on in Texas and also trans-border cooperation. I think it will be very interesting in terms of what we are trying to develop here.

Sara Heitshu is from the University of Arizona, not Arizona University at Tempe/Tucson. She's from the University of Arizona at Tucson. She was a CRL intern in 1978-79. She has published quite a bit. I'll just mention a couple of articles. One was called "Changing Acquisitions Systems: An Evolutionary Process," in Techicalities. Another more recent publication was "Serials Automation: Past, Present and Future." That's in a annual called Advances in Serials Management.

Dora Biblarz is from Arizona State University. She is the Associate Dean of Collection Development there and she has published quite a bit in the areas of collection development. One of her chapters in a book called Library Leadership: Visualizing the Future is called "Information is Power: The Future of Collection Development in Libraries." Another publication that she has done is called "Special Emphasis Acquisition Plans", in Sharing Library Collections for the 1980's. She has also done some consultations at Tufts University and George Washington University.

Jeanne Sohn is from the University of New Mexico. She is the Associate Dean at the University of New Mexico Library. She has published quite a bit and has also been very active in ALA, as have all of these people. Two publications that I want to mention, one called "Out of the Morass: Acquiring Spanish Language Materials from Latin America" that was in Library Journal. Another article that she has published is called "Cooperative Collection Development: A Brief Overview", in the journal Collection Management. She also serves on the editorial board of the journal Collection Management.

Our keynote speaker, Dr. Paul Mosher is from the University of Pennsylvania. He is Vice Provost and Director of Libraries. He was just recently at Stanford and he has been trying to get to the University of Pennsylvania via Australia/New Zealand. He has published, quite prolifically. A couple of titles I'll mention are "A National Scheme for Collaboration and Collection Development: The RLG-NCIP Effort," in Resource Sharing and Information Networks, (with Nancy Gwinn). He has published "Toward Nationwide Coordination of Collection Development by Research Libraries: The RLG Conspectus" and that was in College and Research Libraries. He has published numerous other articles on collection assessment and evaluation. He has also worked with the Alaska State-Wide Project and the Pacific Northwest Project in terms of coordinated cooperative collection development programs up there. Paul's talk is, I hope, going to help us realize the utility of what the commission has recommended in terms of cooperating acquisition programs in New Mexico. It's entitled "Collaborative Collection Development in an Era of Financial Limitations."

Collaborative Collection Development in an Era of Financial Limitations

Paul Mosher
University of Pennsylvania

Evolution of Academic Library Collections

Library collections acquire their characteristics over time as the result of many thousands of decisions, some categorical and others individual. The history and nature of collections is largely the result of the cumulation of methods by which the collections have been developed. These methods have varied depending on the public or private nature of the institution and the differing character of academic programs, the degree of local support for library collection development, and the pattern and level of staff support for collection development programs.

Most academic libraries are characterized by the accretion of gifts, both great and small, and the results of the active guidance and contributions of faculty members. Before the 1930's most major university collections were shaped by the gifts and by emphasis on European techniques of collecting which reflected curricular need and focus on "serious scholarly materials," mostly monographic and serial in nature, and quite rigidly defined. The library, in this scheme, was usually the passive repository of materials thus selected, though librarians were often active participants in the identification and solicitation of major gifts or purchases of materials "en bloc." In addition, many academic departments developed their own library collections over the years, under more or less direct faculty control. These, since the 1950's, have increasingly devolved to the central library system.

From the 1930's on, the nature of collecting changed, largely in response to the new needs of graduate research programs in the humanities and social sciences. There was increasing emphasis on primary and original source materials and, after World War II, on information which could be accumulated, abstracted, quantified, manipulated and analyzed. Older materials were often as valuable as current materials, and increased emphasis on foreign area studies created new need for foreign titles from non-traditional sources. Increased study of popular and traditional cultures called for more collecting of ephemeral, popular, "grey" or other elusive materials previously excluded from the serious academic library's collecting purview. As the annual report for one major academic library put it in 1960, "selection of books for a library like this calls for an attempt to foresee the future course of research and to obtain publications that, though they may seem insignificant today, will be wanted by scholars tomorrow."[1]

[1]Joe A. Hewitt and John S. Shipman, "Cooperative Collection Development Among Research Libraries in the Age of Networking," Advances in Library Automation and Networking, I (1987), 225.

The Role of Librarians and Gathering Plans

As library collections grew, so staffs grew apace, and larger academic libraries sought ways to making their collecting efforts more systematic and consistent. Most former departmental libraries were either transformed into branches of a central library system or their books were absorbed into main library collections.

To help the library with its increased collection development responsibilities, and to expend large acquisitions budgets which often exceeded the capacity of library staff and faculty to spend wisely and systematically, many libraries developed a system of blanket orders (all books on certain subject or from certain publishers), or approval plans (the same as blanket orders but with right of return), with experienced dealers or agents.

During the last 25 years, academic librarians have gradually assumed the primary responsibility for library selection. While some libraries concentrated this responsibility in acquisitions departments, others developed cadres of library subject specialists — often called "bibliographers" — to develop the collections of the central library. In many libraries interested faculty are still involved in collection planning, in policy formation, and in collection management decisions; in a few they are still actively involved in selection. But for the most part, collection development and management have become library functions.

This assumption of the selection function in academic libraries by library subject specialists has been one of the most significant developments within the field of U.S. librarianship in the post-war years. It has had an enormous impact on the nature and quality of library collections in the U.S., and it has helped academic librarians in their quest for professional recognition as well as make it possible for academic libraries to create closer and more reciprocal relationships with the faculties of their institutions.

From Selection to Collection Development

Qualities of entrepreneurialism, competitiveness, aggressiveness, and laissez-faire policies characterized the American academic environment for many generations, and academic libraries tended to acquire publications by "wholesale and opportunistic," even "piratical" methods.

Since World War II, the rise and increase of federally supported foreign area programs in American universities and colleges has brought about a great increase in the acquisition of foreign materials by academic libraries, as well as the accumulation of much grey or ephemeral non-book material from those same areas. Despite the initiatives of the Library of Congress and the Association of Research Libraries, substantial amounts of foreign materials are either cataloged very slowly or remain uncataloged, as a recent report (the American Association of Universities on the subject of Foreign Area Studies) points out, thus presenting issues for technical services as well as collection development.

The shift of collection development responsibility to the library from the faculty, and the need for material published in countries which present special problems of bibliographic control and acquisition have resulted in the appointment of subject or area specialists who sometimes carry split assignments as reference, branch or catalog librarians, and other times form a special unit or department in the library. These "bibliographers", as they are often called, have combined American and European theories of collection development, and have compiled collection development policies to guide and focus their work systematically over time and to codify the links between library collecting and academic program need. Bibliographers have made collection development in American academic libraries more conscious, selective and consistent, and have studied, systematized and regularized other functions involved in stewardship of the library's collections. They have coined for the set of related functions (such as weeding, analyzing the utility of collections, systematic study of collection use and users) the term "collection management."

Collection Development

Collection development is a planning process of which the essence of awareness, gained by personal contact and study of the patron community or communities; development of an understanding of what kinds of knowledge and information users need, what they do with it, and what patterns (e.g., formats, types, sources, subjects) of library materials will provide for those needs. Study of context is the foundation for all sound academic library collection development.

Just as important as deciding what the library needs is understanding of how to obtain these materials effectively, which involves close links between collection development and acquisitions functions. An effective collection development program implies the capacity of the library to identify timely and effective sources by which the needed materials, in whatever format or language they are needed, may be obtained.

Development and management of library collections takes place through the exercise of careful planning, and through the exercise of hundreds and thousands of decisions made over many years. It is thus a process of "dynamic incrementalism"; of keeping in mind the shape and needs of the patron communities, and then making categorical or individual decisions over time as to the appropriateness of patterns of decisions for the projected needs of the community of users.

An important element in collection management development is of an appropriate "macro" approach to materials selection. This is a term coined originally by Hendrik Edelman, who argued that too many collection development and acquisitions librarians make too many individual title decisions, thus minimizing their effectiveness over time. Edelman argued that the most effective collection development decisions are those which result in the greatest input of useful titles with the least expenditure of thought and energy on the part of the collection development librarian. Examples of these decisions would be the placing of

standing orders, subscriptions for monographic series or sets, decisions to acquire all of the publications of a specialist publisher, or the development of a thoughtful and sound approval plan profile. Of course, the next step in such a program is to verify that all pieces or issues of sets and series do in fact come in, and effectively claiming them if they do not; thus claiming is also an important function of collection management.

Once a pattern of major collection development decisions has been made, the process of individual title selection begins, in order to fill in the many gaps or holes left after the macro process is carried out. However, this "micro" of individual title selection then becomes clearer and more manageable as the result of the larger decisions already made.

The collection development process should be guided by conscious library policy, set forth in a collection development policy statement. A collection development policy statement is a codification, in a format comprehensible to appropriate audiences, of how collection development works in a given library. In fact, most libraries already have collection development policies, it is just that they are not written down. I recommend that larger academic libraries which are either undertaking their collection development policy statement preparation for the first time, or which are revising their policies, use the NCIP Conspectus format as the basis for their own policies. Smaller libraries might well use adaptations of this process developed for their use, such as that being used in the Pacific Northwest by the libraries participating in the Pacific Northwest Conspectus Database program. This method establishes a way of expressing existing collection strengths, current collection intensities, and intended collecting strengths using a uniform, reasonable consistent set of descriptors or codes, thus clarifying the universe which is to be described, and making it possible for libraries to discuss collaborative efforts through a common descriptive language.

Collection development policies communicate library policies to a variety of audiences inside and outside the library, including library patrons, other librarians and library units, departmental and school administrators, boards or funding agencies, and other libraries. It serves as a contract between the librarian, the faculty, and the administration, and it provided information about both practice and policy. The collection development policy statement is a politically useful instrument for the librarian as well as a guide for the development of the libraries collections. It is also an effective contribution to the library accreditation process, and for budget preparation and negotiation.

Every librarian in my experience who has actually completed a collection development policy or a part of a policy has said that the most valuable part of preparing it is not the recorded data, as valuable as that is, but the process itself. There is a real "high" inherent in learning and mapping one's existing collections, and working with a team of other librarians and users to decide what the collection should be that it is not yet. If knowledge is power, the knowledge gained through analyzing collections, patron groups, and programs, of the need for library materials is powerful indeed.

Collection development policy statements are important as well because they help librarians to achieve greater control over the elements of collection management and development. Librarians have too often been passive agents, responding to the needs of users rather than anticipating and patterning those needs. The collection development policy process helps make librarians change agents rather than reagents, and provides a tool which can be improved and changed over time to help plan and manage the present more effectively with the future in mind.

Collection Management

The evolution of collection development as a major function of academic librarianship has paralleled a concomitant growth of the concept of librarians as stewards of the collections housed in their libraries — in quite a new way. While once librarians were regarded as the "keepers" of the books in their possession, they have now become managers of their collections of library materials in a wide range of formats and media including — but certainly not limited to — books. Collection development librarians have come to apply a number of the tools of the social and behavioral sciences to the study of library collections and the users of library collections, in order to manage more effectively not only the development of library collections, but the collections themselves.

The literature of library science now contains a substantial bibliography of studies on the function of collection management; these include: 1) the study of library use and library users, 2) collection analysis, 3) the preparation and use of collection development policy statements, 4) pruning collections identifying the moving materials to auxiliary storage, 5) library materials budgeting and budget allocation, and 6) selection of materials for preservation and conservation treatment. The RTSD Collection Management and Development Committee is now revising the set of guidelines which set the standards for collection development and management functions in the U.S.

Collaborative Interdependence in the Face of Economic Uncertainty

Cooperation among American libraries for purpose of resource sharing or cooperative collection development is not new; a study of North American library history reveals waves of cooperative spirits and enterprise scattered over many decades. Librarians in the United States — at least since librarianship became a serious professional enterprise around the turn of the century — have exhibited a democratic altruism about formation and its distribution that has resulted in the worlds richest and most extensive library collections and a tradition of library service not exceeded anywhere else on the globe. Collaborative collection development in one guise or another has long been a part of both that spirit and that enterprise.

By early 1983, two-thirds of the libraries belonging to the Association of Research Libraries were involved in some kind of cooperative resource sharing collection development activity. The concept of resource sharing, of which cooperative collection development is both a

useful concomitant and a foundation, has become part of the American library tradition. Cooperative arrangements are not always short lived. Ruth Patrick reported in 1971 that at least ten library consortia established between 1931 and 1950 for resource sharing purposed were still operating - from 11 to 40 years old.[2]

The Myth of Self-Sufficiency

While there is a tradition of cooperation in the sharing of collections, the spirit of altruism has not always been as evident in their development. The natural desire of each institution for academic self-sufficiency and inter-institutional competition helped foster a myth among American Research University Libraries of the self sufficient or "comprehensive" collection which should be possessed by each library with pretensions to greatness. Under this premise, each institution seeks to do all it can using its own resources for its own institutional users under the pretense that is has, or will over time, be able to meet virtually all demands of local users from local collections.

This myth of self-sufficiency has been punctured by a set of collection overlap studies which have covered libraries of all sizes and types. The studies demonstrated that there is a consistently large proportion of unique material distributed among libraries of a region, a state, or even a locality — whatever the mix of libraries. This conclusion is not just true of research libraries; it also applied to multi-type libraries, or small academic libraries with different sets of programs. One surprising discovery was that it is even true of very small libraries in the same locality. In Juneau, Alaska, for example, three libraries which form the Capital City Consortium have only a 15% overlap in book, and 24% in serials in the field of education (the consortium involves one college, one public, and one state library).

Unfortunately, the situation developed randomly rather than through planning, so the three institutions are left without many useful core titles desired by users of all the institutions. Cooperation would have allowed collaborative development of core or basic collections as well as planned evolution of collections of lesser used materials, thus enlarging the pool of useful resources available to all users. The literature shows similar patterns among libraries of all types and sizes in many configurations and in many parts of the country.[3]

[2]Ruth J. Patrick, Guidelines for Library Cooperation: Development of Academic Library Consortia. Santa Monica, 1972.

[3]The results of the overlap studies are outlined in Paul Mosher,"A National Scheme for Collaboration in Collection Development: The RLG-NICP Effort," Coordinating Cooperative Collection Development: A National Perspective. Resource Sharing and Information Networks. II (1985) Numbers 3/4, pp 22-23; and in Mosher, "Quality in Library Collections: New Directions in Research and Practive in Collection Evaluation," Advances in Librarianship. 13 (1984), 227-230.

We have come to recognize in the United States that circumstances call for cooperation in the development of collections and in their management as well — ways of optimizing each library's capacity to serve its constituency with basic core materials and to link with other libraries in partnership or consortia that will allow access to the collectively much greater resources of all participants. We understand that cooperation permits libraries to serve their patrons and programs better, as they come to feel less collection-driven and more client - and program - driven.

Recognizing that past cooperative acquisitions programs and categorical coordinated collection development efforts such as the National Program of Acquisitions and Cataloguing and the Public Law-480 Program have encouraged a fair amount of duplication of little-used foreign materials among the nation's major research libraries, collection development librarians of the Research Libraries Group began their Conspectus program in 1980. By mapping and rationalizing the research collections of member libraries using a common framework (based on the Library of Congress classification system) and a set of standard codes for representing collecting intensities, strength of existing collections, and characteristics of materials collected, they sought to create a tool which would foster and facilitate collaboration in the areas of collection management and development. Conspectus is intended to allow improved local and cooperative collection planning and management options and clearer understanding of collections, collecting efforts, and commitments by participating libraries. The Conspectus has been adopted as a tool for all member libraries by the Association of Research Libraries in the form of the North American Collections Inventory Project (NCIP), and the Research Libraries of Canada have joined in the effort as well. There are also several foreign programs based upon the Conspectus frame. These new initiatives differ from previous cooperative efforts, such as the Farmington Plan, in their focus on clarity and economy in collection development and management rather than blanket acquisition. The Conspectus is facilitative and encouraging of local and consortial planning rather than operational in nature, and is collectively supported by partner libraries rather than depending upon federal subsidies. NCIP and the data contained in its Conspectus may also provide the basis for a variety of cooperative efforts in the distribution, cataloguing, and preservation of materials as well as in providing for their acquisition.

The RLG and NCIP efforts recognize that all of the significant books in any field of scholarly research are not held by a single library, not even the largest. As the comparative overlay or "verification" studies of the RLG Conspectus Project have shown, holdings are distributed among libraries in fascinating — and not always predictable — patterns. Even the Library of Congress with its 14,000,000 volumes is exceeded by university libraries in holdings in a number of disciplines, such as agricultural economics. In other fields such as French literature, no library - including the Library of Congress - held more than 62% of the scholarly titles cited by the overlap-verification study. On the other hand, four large university libraries together possessed 83% of the scholarly titles cited by the overlap-verification study. This data supports Pat Battin's argument that: "if we are to acknowledge openly our heretofore implicit acceptance of the responsibility for the health of national scholarship, we must channel our energies into the design and development of effective cooperative activities at

the national level, which will then enable us to discharge our obligations to our regional and local colleagues."[4] And these cooperative efforts must involve collaboration and distribution of effort among libraries both within large consortia of research libraries, and among libraries of many types and many sized across the country.

In this new environment, most of us begin to recognize that librarians no longer need to seek the unattainable goal of self sufficiency. We recognize that circumstances call for collaboration - distribution of responsibility in ways that will create a pattern of collaborative interdependence. This allows each library to optimize its capacity to serve its constituency with basic core materials, and link with other libraries in consortia or networks to allow access to the collective research resources of all participants. In this framework, the unique or uncommonly held materials of each library connect with these of other libraries in a pattern not unlike that of the branch libraries of a large university campus research library network. The lesser-used collections of all thus become resources for each, and the capacity to support the work of scholarship becomes greater, so long as physical and bibliographic access are adequately provided. Such a construct permits participating libraries to serve their patrons and programs better through providing collective access to information resources much greater than those of any single component library. The point of it all is to optimize the local effectiveness of each dollar, while increasing user access to information resources through collaborative interdependence.

Collaboration, Interdependence and Attitudes

What is the difference between "collaboration" and the more commonly used term "cooperation?" We may understand cooperation as the environment for the needed programs, but it is, in fact, only an environmental quality, not the goal itself. Cooperation may be understood as the means of achieving collaboration. Misunderstanding of this point has often in the past caused failure or inadequacy in cooperative programs and a great deal of impatience and dissatisfaction on the part of those participating. The goal, fostered by the atmosphere of cooperation is collaboration: working, laboring, thinking, and planning together in new communities of enterprise which transcend the walls of our local libraries — or even of our large campus library complexes. Collaborative collection development requires communities of librarians who know their patrons and their programs well, and who are active rather than passive in their approach to collections. It requires librarians who are change agents rather than reagents - the agents of pro-active change rather than the effects of it.

When we begin to consider collaboration and collection development we enter into an unusual dimension of collection development, one seldom mentioned in the literature: the

[4]Patricia N. Battin, "Research Libraries in the Network Environment: The Case for Cooperation" Journal of Academic Librarianship, 6 (1980), 70.

realm of attitudes. Although attitudes have always been there, the domain of attitudes has seldom been recognized or discussed as such. Yet attitudes form the context in which all human activities take place; they are an essential element of culture, and they are vital in terms of the functions of collection development and management. Perhaps it is because we so often consider collection management as formal, individual enterprise that we fail to consider the human, collective aspects of the process. When we write about or discuss management, control, organization and structure of collection development, we miss a key aspect of the enterprise. In fact, collection management is largely a social or cultural enterprise carried out both by individuals and communities of individuals who often are motivated as much or more by beliefs or attitudes as by structures, rules, or codes. Collaboration in this enterprise requires social structures, common information, and shared attitudes, beliefs and goals before it can be successful.

Librarianship is often understood to be an applied social science, or a branch of organizational behavior; so it may be, but it is also a social enterprise, with culture rather than structure at its base, and with communication between humans rather than control by management as its operational routine. Collection management and development is often explained by the use of mechanical metaphors or structures by librarians, perhaps in an effort to reduce the complexity of the issue and the traditions formed about the nature of this library function.

The essence of collection management and development is not budgetary or organizational, but cultural, though these other two elements are also present and significant. Collaboration in collection development is reached by the achievement of common goals rather than by a process of working out personal differences or organizational mandates. Collaboration is achieved by working ahead, planning, reflecting, and talking with both users and colleagues about the collections, the programs they serve, and about aspirations for the collections for the future. The accomplishment of working collaboration among people doing selection and making collection management decisions is more central to effectiveness than distribution of subject, language, discipline or format (though this latter aspect should not be neglected).

If effective working teams are formed which posses commonality of values, shared purpose and function, have agreed upon desired goals and on a set of objectives, a mutually acceptable time frame, and means they will use to achieve those goals, effective distribution of responsibility is likely to be a natural outcome along with other functionally desirable outcomes less readily perceived at the outset.

Recent study by psychologists of cooperation in organizations supports the view that effective cooperation is most readily achieved through formation of small working teams or communities consisting of relatively small numbers of workers. These workers should focus on sets of mutually desirable interdependencies and outcomes that link stakeholders, rather than emphasize the issues or problems of a single stakeholder. Such groups tend to foster cooperation rather than competition, and collaboration has been shown to strengthen such groups and encourage them to complete more challenging task. Collaboration — working together — on cooperative goals, fosters good work relationships, high morale, productivity

and effective group integration.[5] Factors crucial to effective collaboration include: 1) effective mutual communication, 2) helpful and facilitative attitudes, 3) mutual sensitivity to needs, motives, and concerns, and 4) a cooperative and supportive role by administrators.

Small groups generate expected and actual assistance, more effective communication, shared influence, task orientation, friendliness and support. Effective outcomes are optimized through the helping network and environment based on these groups or teams, which foster open discussion of different viewpoints and work-related issues. The work of small groups is often better than that of isolated workers. Studies of group performance have demonstrated that the highest verbal and arithmetical reasoning performance was observed under situation of intergroup cooperation; shared attitudes fostered cooperation. It has also been shown that collaboration in groups engenders greater work-related learning by all participants. Various members of the groups know various amounts about the subjects of discussion. In order to make the references understood, they draw on knowledge and beliefs shared by members of the group. Experts and novices must assess each other's expertise and accommodate their differences, and in so doing evaluate, supply, and acquire more knowledge then they would as individuals acting independently in these same tasks.[6]

The results of such studies emphasize the significance of the informal and social aspects of collection development and the importance of intergroup or team learning and behavior in forming and carrying out collaborative efforts within a cooperative collection development program. They emphasize the benefits of both collaboration and interdependence in cooperative effort — factors that are important at two levels: that of selectors or bibliographers, and that of the libraries themselves.

Studies such as these underscore the importance of the human interrelationships that underlie the protocols in any resource sharing or cooperative collection development program. Protocols, structures and guidelines, the Conspectus and policies, lay the foundation for or record the decisions of participants in the collaborative effort necessary to create cooperation, but is is groups or teams of humans, working collaboratively, that most effectively achieve cooperative collection development goals.

Another important point about cooperation and collaboration is that they are idealistic in motivation and need to become habitual and customary to become effective. Since effective

[5]Hewit and Shipman, 207.

[6](See, for example, Dean Tjosvold, "Cooperation Theory and Organization," Human Relations, 37 (1984), 743-67; Barbara Gray, "Conditions Facilitating Inter-organizational Collaboration," Human Relations, 38 (1985), 911-36; Donald T. Tuler, Professor- practitioner Collaboration: An Analysis for Factors Enhancing Collaboration in Education, (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1938).

collaboration in the collection development sphere is the result of changes in many individual decisions made by many human beings, it must be the result of habit guided by shared ideals and beliefs as well as shared protocols. The effects of genuine collaboration or cooperation in collection development are "minimalist" rather then "dramatic". They result in ongoing changes in the pattern of the carpet, rather than the sudden appearance of vinyl flooring.

Effectiveness in cooperative collection development means that the processes of selection and decision making will be modified in practice by individuals carrying out their work in ways that will achieve collectively determined and desirable goals.

These arguments are supported by the results of one of the most important recent investigations in the field of collection development — one that has also demonstrated the potential benefits to be achieved by collaboration among small groups of individuals working together in the area of cooperative collection development. This is the Conoco Study carried out under the auspices of the Research Libraries Group over the last few years. Funded by Conoco, Inc., a project team of members of the Collection Management and Development Committee of RLG (bibliographers from participating institutions and central staff) involved groups of bibliographers from the humanities (German literature) and sciences (Geology) to examine the degree to which cooperative collection development could be effective, and whether cooperative collection development goals could be effectively internalized by bibliographers in ways that would affect their long-term decision-making behavior.[7] The findings in two areas are particularly relevant here: selector behavior in relation to identified resource sharing goals and collection overlap.

It was found that German selectors were willing to change 40% of their selection decisions and rely on collections at other institutions if they could be reasonably assured of both bibliographic access and physical availability of items in those other collections. Geology selectors were proved willing to focus cooperative action on materials which they consider as belonging to portions of their collections outside the basic or instructional needs of their institutions. They were reluctant to consider relying on other collections for materials they identified as important to the core of their work — usually curricular, instructional, or basic reference materials.

The bibliographers indicated that their standard for delivery of materials in order to achieve cooperative reliance was no more than seven days for humanities materials, and no more then three days for materials in the sciences. In terms of overlap, the amount and spread of

[7]Ellen A. Issacs, and Herbert H. Clark, "Reference in Conversation Between Experts and Novices," Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 116 (1987), 26-37; Rupert Brown and Domino Adams "The Effects of Intergroup Similarity and Goal Interdependence on Intergroup Attitudes and Task Performance," Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 22 (1986), 78-92.

uniquely held items was both greater and more widely spread than bibliographers had anticipated and, not surprisingly, geology collections proved more homogeneous than German collections because of the greater dependence by geologists on journal-based literature.[8]

The results of the Conoco study of bibliographer behavior in the cooperative collection development situation are heartening, and demonstrate that potential benefits of cooperation are real. The results demonstrate the benefit — perhaps the necessity — of personal collaboration in meetings, and team building and team work among bibliographers in achieving the potential benefits of cooperative collection development. The Conoco study involved collaborative effort among participating bibliographers, who were brought together to carry out the study and design the outcome as well as prepare to achieve them. It may well be that this element — collaboration among bibliographers or selectors from libraries participating in cooperative collection development ventures — is the essential element in developing the collaborative interdependence necessary for effective results in cooperative collection development, and that such activity should be a part of the planning and funding for all cooperative collection development ventures.

Bart Harloe - I think that should provide a good introduction in its general frame of reference. Next up is Jeanne Sohn and she is going to talk about cooperative collection development from the New Mexico point of view.

[8]"Conoco Project: Executive Summary." An unpublished report. The Research Libraries Group, Stanford, CA., May 12, 1987. Participating institutions in German were Columbia, Brigham Young, Cornell, N.Y.P.L., Stanford, Northwestern, Pennsylvania, Minnesota and Yale. Those in Geology were Colorado State, Columbia, Iowa, Minnesota, Stanton, N.Y.P.C. and Suny Stony Brook.

Cooperative Collection Development: The New Mexico Point of View

Jeanne Sohn
University of New Mexico

I've been asked to speak to you today about cooperative collection development from the New Mexico point of view. Before I get to that specific point, I'd like to give you a little background. I first became acquainted with cooperative collection development in the city where Paul Mosher now lives and works. I was Head of Collection Development at Temple University in Philadelphia. It was the mid-70's and we were beginning to feel some budgetary constraints. At that time there was a regional consortium called MARLIN - Middle Atlantic Research Libraries Information Network - the directors of which met semi-annually. Several of the collection development librarians managed to convince our directors that we should attend one of these meetings to discuss cooperation at our level. It was no easy task but meet we did. Unfortunately, I can recall little coming from that meeting other than people agreeing to disagree. The point was made constantly that cooperation across state lines by state-funded schools would be impossible. How could University of Maryland cooperate in a joint purchase with Rutgers or Penn State? In fact, at that point in time, even resource sharing in the city was virtually impossible. I can recall a joint purchase that Temple made with Penn and everyone at Temple was furious that the materials weren't housed there. No one wanted to be involved with that again.

Interestingly, several years later, most of these MARLIN libraries became members of RLG with all of the concomitant cooperative agreements. These RLG libraries became involved in Conspectus work and adhered to very liberal resource sharing agreements.

Not too long after Temple became an RLG library, I came to New Mexico to interview for the collection development position at UNM. I was fired up about cooperative collection development and the Conspectus and wanted to tell the world about it. Consequently, my interview presentation focused on this very topic. Well, it fell as flat as the proverbial pancake. What I did not know were the local politics of libraries in New Mexico in 1981. At that time, NMSU and UNM were barely on speaking terms, the University of Albuquerque was teetering on the brink and was soon to close, and everyone was furious with UNM because of the 1970's Bond Issue. Despite my naivete, I got the job. However, cooperative collection development was NOT to be something I could do anything about. I did remain interested enough in it to write an article, but that was the extent of my involvement.

There was, of course, and still may be a certain amount of scoffing about applying techniques of cooperative collection development from the BOSNYWASH metroplex to New Mexico. You can deal with cooperation when you have Penn and Princeton virtually next door. How can you possibly do it in a state like New Mexico? The distances are too great, there are too few academic libraries, the collections in the state are insignificant, there's barely enough

funding for the individual libraries to purchase their own materials, let alone share. And as Paul has just pointed out "Scholars want what they want, when they want it, whether or not they fully know what it is that they want."

Well, even these aren't valid excuses when you consider the Alaska experience. I'm sure if you ask him later, Paul will be able to give you considerable information about this since he was involved with it. I first learned about what Alaska was doing at a 1985 ALA program with which I was involved. At that time Dennis Stephens, Collection Development Officer at the University of Alaska - Fairbanks, gave a presentation called "Enlightened Self-Interest: Planning for Cooperative Collection Development in Alaska and the Pacific Northwest." The project which Dennis described is a multi-type library plan "whose goal is to devise a state-wide coordinated collection development and management program." A Conspectus-based approach was adopted to survey existing information resources and collecting activity to provide local collection management information and as a basis for achieving cooperative collection agreements.

Does the following sound familiar? Dennis describes Alaska as "a state characterized by relatively new and underdeveloped library resources, unstable funding for materials, and a population of just over 400,000 souls in a land mass one-fifth the size of the 48 contiguous states .... All of Alaska's collections together might be equal to a reasonable medium-sized university research library." Despite or perhaps because of the geography, distances and dispersed populations of the region as well as low per capita spending for libraries, a great need for better access to information was perceived. Consequently in 1982, when the Alaska State Library received funds from the legislature "to promote interlibrary cooperation," the librarians turned it toward "state-wide collection development."

I hope I've made my point. Cooperative collection development need not be the exclusive property of the large research libraries or of urban consortia. It is indeed an activity which New Mexico is well able to undertake and which is very belated in coming to the state.

I don't wish to imply that some cooperation has not occurred here. Some of you who have been in the state longer than I will undoubtedly have a better and more thorough historical view of what has occurred. For example, although I personally am not familiar with CLS (Coordinated Library Systems), this organization was endorsed in 1971 by NMLA and the State Library Commission. It involved coordination of library resources on existing resource strengths, would create new resources only where serious deficiencies existed, and would avoid unnecessary duplication of collections. CLS was instrumental in influencing the formation of a Task Force on a State-wide Interlibrary Cooperative System for New Mexico, whose final report was made in December 1977. Focusing primarily on ILL and reciprocal borrowing agreements, this task force did influence many of the ILL policies that are operative today.

And then there was CONMAL, Council of New Mexico Academic Libraries, consisting of all publicly supported post-secondary academic libraries in the state. I know that it was in existence in 1977, but how active it was after that, I cannot say. I don't believe that there were any meetings held after 1981.

But, that was then and now there are many changes occurring in New Mexico. First of all, there has been a dramatic change in the cast of characters. Of the six four-year institutions, five have acquired new directors since 1981. The internecine wars have been forgotten and there is a new spirit of cooperation.

Exemplifying this, a little over two weeks ago, a new council was formalized — the Four Year University Librarians' Council. Its purpose is to provide "means for on-going communication to improve the welfare and aid in the search for solutions to common problems." It will meet at least twice a year and I believe has great potential for bringing these libraries together as a strong working unit.

At the same meeting in Espanola, an even more significant body was created - the New Mexico Consortium of Academic Libraries. The Consortium is made up of the chief librarians from the Learning Resource Center as well as the four-year universities. As one of its several goals, the Consortium "will provide the means to devise and carry out projects of common usefulness such as: enhanced library cooperation for resource sharing, collection development and improved funding for library acquisitions in all academic libraries." REPEAT — in ALL academic libraries.

I do not believe it entirely coincidental that the New Mexico Commission on Higher Education is thinking along exactly the same lines. In their report Planning for the Class of 2005: A View for the Future, published in September of this year, CHE includes the specific recommendation that consortia be established "to address specific needs ... in fostering interinstitutional cooperation, pooled resources, cost efficiencies, and increased effectiveness." It should come as no surprise that the formation of a library consortium was noted specifically. Furthermore, in its Policy #13 on Equitable Funding, it recommends developing new funding formulae which "promote joint programs and other sharing of resources among institutions." CHE continues with specific library recommendations [and if you have not read the 2005 Report, you may find this next section of considerable interest] and please forgive me for reading this to you.

Library Funding:

> New Mexico college and university libraries face critical problems because the cost of library acquisitions and materials continues to increase more rapidly than the general rate of inflation. The contributing factor to this problem is the current formula which provides resources for academic support, including libraries, based on a percentage of instruction expenditures. No provisions are made in the current formula for specific program-related library resource requirements or for the specific costs of library operations and acquisitions. Further, state-level policies which seek to enhance graduate education at the research universities will result in additional needs for library acquisitions and support services.
>
> In light of the increasing demands for library materials, the rising cost of acquisitions and the advent of new technologies in the field of library science, consideration must

be given to state-wide issues of bibliographic control, acquisitions policy, and coordination of resources within other in-state and out-of-state institutions and libraries.

The Commission makes two specific recommendations with regard to library funding:

1) By the 1990-1991 funding cycle, the existing two-year and four-year academic support formulas should be replaced with formulas which recognize the library requirements of individual academic programs and the specific costs related to library operations and materials.

2) To increase the quality and efficiency of the higher education library system, the Commission should coordinate the development of and approve a state-wide acquisition policy. The policy should provide the framework for the in cremental development of higher education libraries in a manner consistent with institution long range plans and external accreditation requirements. It should ensure that the overall library system is operated in a responsive and efficient manner. The policy should specifically encourage the development of consortia for the acquisition and sharing of library materials. If necessary, state resources should be provided to encourage such efforts.

To paraphrase Bob Dylan, "It doesn't take a weatherman to tell which way the wind blows." We in New Mexico have our charge to develop a state-wide acquisition policy, specifically through the development of consortia for acquisition and sharing of library materials. The Commission has determined for us that not one of us can be self-sufficient. What we must do now is make sure that we, the librarians in New Mexico, control how this will be accomplished. WE must come up with the plan; WE must develop the coordinated collection development policy; WE must provide the framework for cooperative collection development in the state.

We are at a good point. We have the organization to help us succeed in the New Mexico Consortium of Academic Libraries. We have various models to follow with a number of state ventures not only Alaska but Alabama, Illinois and others. We have the technical ability, the access tools. And I believe that many of us have the interest and the will to succeed.

We can speak altruistically of cooperative collection development and the benefits that will accrue to our libraries — improving collection management, stretching the materials budget, making better selection decisions, serving the user better. But all of this will not happen automatically or spontaneously. A commitment is needed. A great deal of planning will be necessary, as will tolerance, tact, patience and mutual understanding. I would like to believe that we academic librarians in New Mexico are up to the task before use and that we will succeed. Thank you.

Bart Harloe - Next up is Dora Biblarz from Arizona State University and she is going to talk to us about collection policy statements and also share some of the experiences they have had in Arizona with cooperative efforts.

Collection Development Policies and the Arizona Experience

Dora Biblarz
Arizona State University

I am speaking about cooperative collection development and specifically the efforts made so far in the state of Arizona from the perspective of Arizona State University, since I believe my colleague, Sara Heitshu, will be covering the topic from the view of the University of Arizona.

We have attempted cooperative ventures in various small areas, but nothing really broad and far-reaching has occurred at this time. From my analysis I would say we are in a state of coordination: we are aware of each others' strengths and weaknesses in a general, overall fashion. For instance, there are excellent collections on regional history and anthropology as well as outstanding area studies collections in Latin America.

By coordination I mean that the collection development people in the three universities have informally been advising each other about titles that we are planning to get so that we can avoid duplication of expensive items or esoteric material within narrow areas of research. We have also tried to inform each other about these materials and how they relate to our strengths so that we can more easily direct patrons to the best location for specific types of research within the state. The users can then choose to query inter-library loan or even make the drive personally to either Tucson or Flagstaff, where Northern Arizona University is located. Some efforts have been made to document these areas of strength and the special collections that are of interest so that patrons can be directed to ILL on a more routine basis.

In specific instances much more could be done to make it an active, rather than a passive type of cooperative resource-sharing. For instance, this past year, when everyone was reviewing periodicals for possible cuts, we did share the lists with the other two universities to alert everyone about the cancellations that were eventually made.

The greatest drawback to effective cooperation now is the fact that our users are not able to search the holdings of other libraries in the state directly. This makes the process of discovering the holdings of each library time-consuming and cumbersome, thereby discouraging use.

One of the ideas which I hope we will pursue more actively in the near future is a systematic approach to cooperation by identifying specific subject areas and analyzing strengths and weaknesses in those fields in each library. For instance, Medieval and Renaissance Studies, or Native American history are two potential areas that each university library could analyze, then, depending on resulting strengths, each one might receive a primary collecting responsibility according to a particular breakdown, say language coverage, geographical area, or even a specific subject such as religion in Germany in the Middle Ages.

The model illustrated by SALALM (Seminar on the Acquisition of Latin American Library Materials) which many of you are no doubt already aware of is one excellent way to establish a cooperative network. In this model, certain university libraries have agreed to cover the publishing output of a specific Latin American country and catalog that material first, entering titles into the bibliographic utility so that the others can profit from the information in the data base and need not waste their resources on redundant cataloging.

There is a smaller network that we participate in with other Southwestern states: this is for the collection of materials from neighboring states in Northern Mexico. Each participating state in the U.S. (Texas, New Mexico, Arizona and California) has an assigned state in Northern Mexico and the agreement is to try to be as comprehensive as possible in collecting efforts within the assigned area.

Another excellent model for cooperative resource-sharing comes from the University of California system, where they have committed a portion of their annual budget to shared purchases. This process has been going on for several years now, and the collection development officers of the nine campuses meet regularly to discuss the candidates, vote on them, and decide if there should be one copy for the entire system or if two are needed - one for the north and one for the south. The money for these purchases comes off the top of the materials budget for the entire system; users have reciprocal borrowing privileges.

Before any serious cooperative collection development efforts could be initiated in Arizona, we at ASU felt we needed to consider a number of factors which would be critical to its success. We managed to avoid the "topsy" and the "turvey" as well as the university bibliographers and actually came in on the last 25 years that Paul Mosher described earlier. Since ASU is relatively young as far as universities are concerned (PhDs have only been offered here for about 25-30 years), we knew that there would be areas of questionable status - perhaps even serious deficiency. Further, we had individuals on the staff who worked on collection development but until the past ten years or so, not enough money was available in the budget for library materials to meet the basic needs.

We developed a method to analyze our collection strengths relative to academic needs, and to some extent, research areas. This became the basis for our Collection Development Policy Statement, which I am glad to be able to leave for NMSU so that we may more easily pursue cooperative activities in the future. This document was compiled following the ARL Conspectus methodology and we used the same general codes for levels, although we did not go to the fine detail actually required by the Conspectus.

To find out what was needed for academic and curriculum support, we analyzed the course offerings represented in the college catalog and gave each course LC subject headings and a general LC call number. This information was entered into the mainframe and lists were produced that showed what subject headings and call numbers were of interest in our university. These lists were then compared with our actual holdings to see if we could determine what subjects we were not covering at all, or not covering in the depth needed by the curriculum. After that, the collection was analyzed and various methods were used to come up with the conspectus levels that you see in the document.

While we've had several types of informal cooperative collection development agreements, I believe that a detailed policy statement/conspectus is the key to successful working cooperative agreements in specific areas in the future. One area we are pursuing in this manner is in anthropology, which is a subject of great importance in the southwest. The subject specialist for anthropology at ASU is working with her counterpart at the U of A to try to identify the relative strengths at each institution and will be pursuing a model of cooperative resource-sharing that we hope will result in true sharing, rather than duplicating each others' collections.

It is important to realize that there is not money to be saved by cooperative activities; instead, the greatest service we can perform for our users is to stretch the limited library dollars as far as they can go. With cooperative collection development, we can make commitments to go into more depth in one area and perhaps avoid duplication in another, which might be more peripheral in interest.

The work involved in executing cooperative collection agreements must be done by the selectors, both individually and in small groups, since they are the folks who go out and promote the collections, work with the users, and perform bibliographic instruction.

On the statewide level, the State Library of Arizona has made resource-sharing and cooperative collection development a high priority in their long-range plan. Their goal is to have collection analyses performed in each library in the state in the next three to five years. From these, they plan to collect the policy statements of all types of libraries and create a clearinghouse of the collection strengths and weaknesses within the state. In the longer term, the goal is online bibliographic access throughout the state to let users in all areas know quickly and more easily what resources are available.

From the evidence presented today, however, it appears that our neighbors in New Mexico may be way ahead of us in the field of resource-sharing. We will look to you to develop a workable model that we can use in Arizona in the near future.

Bart Harloe - Thank you Dora. Next up is Sara Heitshu who is the Assistant University Librarian for Technical Services at the University of Arizona and she is going to talk to us about the more technical aspects of cooperative collection development.

Technical Aspects of Cooperative Collection Development

Sara Heitshu
University of Arizona

I asked our Folklore Center Director Jim Griffith for an appropriate southwestern story to tell at a conference on Cooperative Collection Development. Jim gave me the following story complete with its "genealogy" which I will omit here in the interest of time. A woman from Arizona went to the Hudson River Valley to visit an old school friend. All week her eastern friend regaled her with the glories of the green and verdant river valley, and all week the woman from Arizona remained silent. Finally her friend could stand it no longer. "Come on, tell me what you think of our beautiful Hudson River." The woman from Arizona replied, "I will when the water stops flowing and I can see the river." This is what I think happens when we talk about collection development. A goal, the water, becomes cooperation for its own sake, and it can cover the river bed, access to materials regardless of location. Cooperation is merely the process by which we achieve our goal of access to materials regardless of location which are needed by the students and faculty on our campuses to meet their teaching and research needs.

I am not opposed to collection development policies. They can provide useful road maps to chart where we have been and where we think we are going with our collections. They can point out the areas in which we are most likely to be of assistance to one another, but, they do not accomplish what I consider to be the ultimate goal of cooperation — the sharing of information about exactly which books and serials a library holds and can therefore loan to another library in its cooperative network. A colleague said to me not long ago that if all of the money and staff resources which have been poured into the RLG Conspectus and the NCIP Project had been spent on retrospective conversion and on clearing out our cataloging backlogs, we would be a lot closer to the true sharing of library resources which would meet the needs of our library users.

Assuming that the cooperative agreements are in place and an interlibrary loan and document delivery system are operative, what our faculty and students want to know is where is what I want and how soon can I get it.

How we create and share these bibliographic records now and in the future is an interesting problem. Let me talk about two approaches to the problem, both based on the old war horses of library cooperation — serials union lists and shared catalog records. In Arizona serials union listing has been a highly successful cooperative project using Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) funding and local money to create an OCLC union list of serials. The larger public libraries and all of the academic libraries in the state were part of the initial project. Each library was responsible for providing a portion of the local funds and for preparing its serials titles and holdings for inputting by the central staff.

Today the union list, called SOLAR by us and SOAR on OCLC, has expanded to include many of the state's smaller libraries. It is available on-line in OCLC, and a microfiche list is regularly produced and distributed to all of the members. A library does not need to be an active OCLC participant to be part of the project. Members may have their records extracted and a printed or fiche product produced at their expense. The University of Arizona Health Sciences Library has done this and sells copies of its paper list to interested libraries.

While I do not have scientific data to show that the University of Arizona Library's participation in the SOLAR union listing group has affected our interlibrary loan, the head of Interlibrary Loan and I are both convinced that we receive many more requests for serials from literally around the world based on the addition of our holdings symbol to more than 38,000 existing serials records and the creation of more than 3,000 original serials records.

We have used the SOLAR list in our serials review and cancellation project to discover if a title is in the health sciences library or the law library on our campus or if it is at Arizona State University or Northern Arizona University. If other of our criteria for cancellation fit, we are much more likely to recommend cancellation knowing that the title is still available within the state.

Unfortunately, the SOLAR list project is not easily available to our library users. The searching skill necessary to identify a title through the OCLC serials subsystem is something that even many of the library staff lack. We receive a limited number of microfiche copies of the list, and it is available in the reference areas, but someone must ask specifically if a title is elsewhere in the state or a reference librarian must suggest the list prior to suggesting interlibrary loan.

Now that we have briefly looked at shared serials holdings, let's talk about shared catalog records. Libraries have exchanged cards for years in an effort to assist researchers in identifying materials not available on site. One of the most enduring of these agreements is the one between Duke University and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC). Their exchange of cards for their public catalogs began in the early 1930s and led to the Triangle Research Libraries Network (TRLN) project in the late 1970s. TRLN has produced an on-line catalog shared by Duke, UNC, and North Carolina State University. Whatever one may think of the TRLN project as executed, it clearly points the direction in which libraries must be moving if they are to effectively share resources in a geographic region. Of course, OCLC is the largest union catalog in the nation and the one to which most of us here contribute at the present.

However, as we bring up our on-line catalogs, our use of the OCLC database may change as we seek less costly ways creating our catalog records. Similarly, retrospective conversion projects which do not add a library's symbol to OCLC may be cheaper. But these efforts to save in the short term will not assist us in sharing our valuable resources, the unique titles which are the result of our "topsy-turvy" collection building.

Soon OCLC's configured database will offer us better access than is now possible, and for the near future OCLC is our best tool for cooperative action. However, OCLC remains first

and foremost a library staff member's tool and is not a user friendly database for library patrons.

The Council on Library Resources recognized the need to share bibliographic data and initiated the Linked Systems Project (LSP) with the Library of Congress and the Research Libraries Group more than five years ago. OCLC has since joined the project, and at this time the two networks are able to pass authority records done at selected NACO libraries into the Library of Congress system. Catalog records are scheduled to be created in test libraries and added to the Library of Congress's on-line catalog in the very near future.

All of this sounds pretty far away from Las Cruces, New Mexico, and quite frankly, it is. But, if we are not aware of the implications of the technical work now being done on the linked systems project, we will not be prepared to take advantage of it when it does become available to us.

How many of you have an on-line catalog now? Which one — NOTIS? Carlyle? CARL? CLSI? INNOPAC? VTLS? Right now the best access we can offer one another is a dial-up port with a special telephone number given out only to the reference staff. The library patron must be persistent to uncover the fact that the book or journal which he or she needs is in a neighboring town or state. What we must offer our patrons, particularly our faculty, if they are to believe in cooperative collection development is a network which allows our on-line catalog to speak to the other directly without complex protocols and many different search strategies.

The Linked Systems Project is only the beginning of the solution. It will give use the equivalent of long distance lines to link remote locations. A library automation expert who is currently completing her dissertation on information sharing has repeatedly warned me that libraries and the automation vendors are not prepared to take advantage of LSP. We will soon have the lines to connect us but we are not preparing the "instruments" which can talk to one another over those lines.

It will be our job to insist that our system vendors provide the capacity to use the LSP technology. After all, resource sharing is not their business, it is ours. Only when a patron in Las Cruces can search holdings in Albuquerque or Tempe by simply selecting the UNM or the ASU database after looking at NMSU's catalog, will we be achieving the goal of cooperative collection development.

We have three responsibilities then to prepare our libraries for resource sharing now and in the year 2001. First the creation of bibliographic records whether for union listing, current cataloging or retrospective conversion; second, the continued support of our network, OCLC, as the best way to share data now and in the near future; and third, the preparation or our systems for the full use of the Linked Systems Project's technology.

Bart Harloe - Thank you. That was very good. Last, but certainly not least is Mary Keckley from University of Texas and she is going to talk about some of the things that are going on south of the border.

Trans-Border Cooperation and the Texas Experience

Mary Keckley
University of Texas at El Paso

I am going to focus more on details of access to physical resources. One of the most exciting projects that we are involved in at UT El Paso is a United States-Mexico interlibrary loan project. At this very time, our university librarian, Robert Seal, is in Mexico City working on final details for this cooperative one year project. If you think we are isolated up here, at least we have OCLC. Mexican libraries do not know at all what our resources are on this side of the border and we have very little information about what they have for holdings. Not only do their libraries have to cope with an inadequate mail system, they also have to cope with inadequate resources. They consider our libraries to be extremely rich in holdings. If you think about what we do have, we really are well off. The cooperative project consists of six academic libraries in Mexico and seventeen AMIGOS libraries who have agreed to participate on this side of the border. Because of the mail system, the focal point will be the embassy courier system through Larado, Texas. The U.S. contact point is UT El Paso. In Mexico it will be the Benjamin Franklin Library in Mexico City. Mexican libraries will channel their requests through the Benjamin Franklin Library, which will telefax or send them by mail courier through Larado to UT El Paso. If we can provide the material(s), we will do so and items are sent back to the Benjamin Franklin Library. Books have to be used in the library there. This is a reciprocal agreement between institutions not individuals. If it is photocopied information, of course the borrower can take it home. The details on costs or deposits or other methods of handling currency have not yet been finalized.

For United States libraries who want to request materials from Mexico, they can send requests directly through the courier service to the Benjamin Franklin Library and they will forward them to the appropriate Mexican library. This is a one year pilot project and is restricted to social science and humanities materials only. Reference books, special collections items, sciences, medical, and technology books will not be loaned at this time. When we evaluate, it will be interesting to see how much use there was of the system. I anticipate that the UT El Paso Library and interlibrary loan staff are going to be very busy for several months.

In the original paper, it was mentioned that libraries need to get away from the concept of self-sufficiency. Area librarians are well-aware that our collections are not self-sufficient. We have looked to our closest neighbor in Las Cruces. Our library directors have agreed upon cooperation and collaboration. The first step was really a small group effort with the assistant dean/director and the circulation staffs preparing a policy statement and procedures for reciprocal borrowing. After much discussion we created a policy limited to faculty and graduate students.

Last month we reviewed the agreement and determined that it actually has worked out well. If you are a faculty member from UT El Paso, all you need to do at New Mexico State is to bring in a current valid UTEP ID and you will be given a guest card valid for a year. If you are from New Mexico State you do the same thing at UTEP. There are about 60 people who have taken advantage of the program with graduates slightly outnumbering faculty users. This does not include those individuals who go back and forth between the libraries and only use materials in-house. I think there are a great many people who do that. After the first year, we had only one problem patron. We did get the materials back; however, the fine money is questionable. This patron was sent a letter from each library saying that they could no longer borrow materials from either library until they had paid all fines. We will continue this procedure. This cooperative effort has succeeded primarily because of circulation personnel. They have stayed in touch with each other and on top of situations.

We did draw up a formal agreement that specifically stated there would be a one year trial period and that either side had the right to cancel. This contract was reviewed and agreed to by higher administration on both sides. We are going to continue the agreement and we will probably increase publicity in the future.

The University of Texas system composed of fifteen libraries (UT Dallas, San Antonio, Permian Basin, Tyler, Arlington, El Paso, Austin, the MD Anderson Center, all Health Science Centers and the UT Medical Branch in Galveston) developed a reciprocal borrowing program in 1987. According to those guideline procedures, if you are a valid faculty member or someone who has faculty privileges at your institution, go to your library and they will assign you a scholar's passport, valid for one year. You take that passport and your current ID to any of the other libraries and you can check out books. The privileges you receive are the same as those given to their faculty members. Unfortunately there is no courier service between UT System components or between UTEP and NMSU. This is a cause for patron complaint. Economic issues take precedence however. I am hoping it will be feasible to do something between El Paso and Las Cruces in the future.

What I would like to stress is something very similar to what Paul referred to: success starts with attitudes. Basically it is attitudes of administrators who are willing to make that necessary contact with each other. Willing to talk to their staff, and willing to develop and foster both a feeling of cooperation and the service that is needed. It is not the administrators who are doing the work, it is the interlibrary loan staff, the reference staff, the circulation staff, and eventually cooperation becomes an entire library project. The other aspect of attitudes that I would like to emphasize is that of the patrons and the users. Once we have developed patron expectations and attitudes to the point where they willingly go to other libraries where they expect to receive materials through interlibrary loan, or through document delivery, or courier service, and to where they requlary access other catalogs, there will be no going back to a concept of self-sufficiency!

Bart Harloe - Before we take a brief break, I would like to ask if any of the panelists have a notion of what would be the ideal resource sharing arrangement that might work in your institution, in your state, in your region. Would anyone of you like to speculate, comment, or suggest a model that might work? Well, why don't we come back to that question after the break and give these people a chance to think. I want to thank all of the panelists and I think they all deserve a hand for a very good job. There is a lot here we can work with. We are going to take about a fifteen minute break and assemble back here before four o'clock. Now it is up to you to ask some questions and to create a good controversy here this afternoon. We are really looking forward to that.

Workshop Discussion

Bart Harloe - Next comes the really hard part of the workshop in which the participants need to think about questions. We have some really good resource people here today to deal with some of the issues. I am sure we have local issues, we have regional issues and we have people who are coming from a technical services background, and from public service areas of libraries. So I would like you to come to the podium here, because we are recording this. And could you state your name and institution. That will help us in terms of transcribing the questions later on.

I'd like to start off with a question about resource sharing. We seemed to have left this all in a quandary a few moments ago. My question is: can you have cooperative collection development without resource sharing? Does it really make any sense at all to attempt it? I would like to ask one of our panelists to address that question. Is there someone who is willing to address it?

Paul Mosher - Well, I'm of two minds. First it can take place without it, but it all seems to be part of what should be a indissoluble whole, and that is getting information or knowledge to users. Therefore, ideally, you know that you have the information and you have to have the means of access to discover it and to get it. Ideally that should be as effortless as possible for the user. So, I guess you can look at them as different components. If you try and get the whole package at the same time, you might beggar the state or federal government to try and provide it all. So maybe we should suggest that it is like many other things that we do a piece or part at a time. Heading toward the goal of the whole package. I guess that would be my suggestion and that if you could get the attention of your administrators and your funding agencies to do part A now, you do part A, you do part C now, you do part C, but ultimately, what you're working with your colleagues towards, is to get the pieces or the components of the package put together. But others may disagree with that.

Jeanne Sohn - I think, ideally, you have cooperative collection development and resource sharing. I think the two really go hand in hand because you work out what you are going to collect, how you are going to buy it. But at the same time, I think, there is cooperative or coordinated collection development that precludes resource sharing because of the goals of these specific institutions. For example, if NMSU and UNM were to work out a coordinated collection development policy statement, there would be specific areas that we would probably not be interested in sharing ultimately. I can think of agriculture, I can think of specific areas within the Latin American area, something of this sort; so I think there are some ways where they do overlap, but it is not a necessity to go on with the resource sharing as a concept, in specific areas.

Dora Biblarz - I think that resource sharing is possible and is more important for a state such as Arizona with its sparse population and scarce resources and so if I had a choice, I would start with resource sharing and develop a cooperative collection in development angle as resource sharing becomes very much ingrained in the patterns of use.

Sara Heitshu - I would like to add to that, I think, there is nothing that kills resource sharing and cooperative collection development faster than failures. Unfortunately, Dora and I both know that there has been one major failure because it simply wasn't used and that was when we tried to run a courier service in the state of Arizona, before I was there, and it just finally folded. I think that in part that is because we didn't have easy access to what one another had in our collections. Since that time, another-state wide effort has been mounted by the state library and telefacsimile machines have been put in all of the libraries, the county libraries, the public libraries, and in the three major academic libraries. We use those for rush interlibrary loan requests. They are not real state of the art machines, but it has helped and I do have to tell you that the first use between U of A and ASU was to send the Doonesberry comic strips on Governor Mecham from the institution they were published first to the other city where they were not running it. Anyway, so we make very valuable use of those telefax machines. But again, it was Paul asking me if it was the kind where you could actually lay down and copy books. No, you have to photocopy the book pages and then recopy it through the fax machine. So it is very expensive to use and it still hasn't taken off.

But I do agree with Dora. We have a good interlibrary loan system coordinated again through our state library and that kind of resource sharing, coupled with things like our serials union list project, are really the beginnings, the kind of a foundation, and will work with the other two major academic libraries in the state over time. We will hammer out these policies about what we buy. Now it is more of a case by case basis, like you all bought the patents and we bought the specifications. Anyway, we have spent thousands and thousands of dollars on microfiche sets for our science libraries. If people want really complicated patent searching done, they need to go to ASU and we have all these other kinds of technical specifications at U of A. So those kinds of things have been very successful and have saved a lot of money and everyone in both science libraries knows exactly what to do to get people to what they need in those specific cases.

Paul Mosher - I think it is funny, it is a little bit, like blind persons defining an elephant and each of us will seek out part of the elephant and say that's the chief characteristic or the first characteristic of an elephant. I become a little suspicious of that especially since I changed my spots this last time. So I am seeing different parts of the elephant as I moved. I think that access versus ownership is a misunderstanding of things. You can't have either the delivery or the information. You've got to have both the information and the delivery. Either one is to some extend a distortion. I often hear that you have one which is highest priority and then two and then three and yet when I watch the funding behavior of my institution it never works like that. It's half of two, one third of three, one half of one, one sixteenth of three, one fourth of two, part of revised one-B, and that's the way the money always comes. So it is never that they will fund all of this and then they will fund all of this and then they will all of this. Not only that, you may have different parts of your organization working in different ways. Since the collaboration and collection development is something that must take place for some years before anybody even knows that it exists and since it happens among different people partly through bibliographic control, there is no particular reason why it has to wait until after access is obtained. You begin to change a little bit the pattern of resources to optimize the unique resources available to all. Then there is something to have your access for and to be able to use it with. And the similar thing with regard to bibliographic control.

To take care of it all, to retrospectively convert everything and re-class everything is going to take us all some time. So we work on it in pieces and patches and then we get a big bunch to do this. That can go on. So I expect it is setting up the program, identifying the parts, deciding the funding, what part, where are the staff who would be doing this. You begin to get them going as things then move up to the point where the funding and resources come together, you take advantage of it and you do those parts. Down the line you get it done.

Mary Keckley - I think with collaboration, like in the University of Texas system, with the fourteen libraries together, the regular academic libraries are a little bit outnumbered because half of the group was medical and so they made the decision that their first priority was to obtain the Medline database. And they went back to the UT system itself and said this is our first priority and we want funding for it. Not only do they benefit, but all the other academic libraries benefit. We have a small nursing school at our place, so we have access to that. It will be of use to the entire system and at least then we know where to go for the information. We don't know who has got it yet or who can afford to buy it, but I think, having the access, it is kind of like the chicken and the egg to me, which comes first.

Audience - Harry Llull from UNM Centennial Science Library. My question focuses on the actual building of the collection that each of us do everyday. What is the effect of the approval plans? Yes, we have profiles, different institutions, but the truth of the matter is we have less time to really be bibliographers. We have less money also. I am wondering, are we all seeing the same things and buying the same things whereas before the approval plans maybe in isolation, real collection development was going on. Maybe this is a moot point, I don't know. Maybe it's building a core collection across universities.

Jeanne Sohn - I think what you said at the very end is more to the point. I think approval plans build core collections. They build the standard materials that you need for your basic undergraduate and to some extent lower level graduate courses. But it is the selector who should be developing the more specific collection relating to the goals of the university and what it is working with. I think you can't depend on a approval plan for that kind of more sophisticated material unless you have been working very, very closely with a specialized agent. I can think of world-wide art catalogs or something of that sort which would develop something in that area. But, I think the approval plans are developing strong cores and yes there is going to be a lot of duplication there. When you start getting into association literature, sophisticated journal literature, those kinds of things, the approval plan can't possibly cover it. So I think that you are not going to get homogeneous collections across the board, because the goals of the specific institutions differ.

Sara Heitshu - There's been a paper funded by the Council on Library Resources that was done at the University of Michigan Library. I think it was Jean Loup and I think it was Helen Snoke from the library school on this very subject. They compared, I think it was twenty people who used the BNA Approval Plan program and I believe they studied the political sciences and I think the answer to your question based on their paper, both yes and no, but I suggest that you try to get it. I've got a copy of it maybe I could get it to you if it's

not available some other way but it is an interesting question. We're all getting exactly the same things because we don't have the time to go out there and do the special selection the Jeanne's alluding to.

Paul Mosher - There is other literature on it that would more or less support that. I think it's an excellent question and Jeanne's point was well taken. The literature tends to show that like libraries, the same size libraries over realitively short periods using the same vendor end up with similar collections. But if they're different size libraries, if they're unlike in terms of programs and you take a longer period even if they use the same vendor they end up with different collections. Which is really very interesting. After all they work more or less according to a profile, and you all know the limits on that. They're working for you under contract to do some collection development for you. If you develop your profile well in terms with your needs, unless the other organization has the same profile or unless you really have a lousy approval plan service, probably it won't work out that way. You also will end up with collections more the same under those circumstances if you tend to treat it as if it's a blanket plan and you accept what you're sent. If you send back what you don't want in order to make sure they adjust their profile, it also tends to make them more selective about what you receive.

Audience - Don Riggs, Arizona State University. I don't have a question, but I have a couple of points. First I want to explain why we stopped the courier service. U of A is only 120 miles from ASU, quite frankly we couldn't find a driver who would remain sober. On a more serious note. I think it's very commendable on the part of the New Mexico Commission on Higher Education to emphasize resource sharing among the academic libraries. I think perhaps New Mexico should look at Colorado. Colorado has a real fine system on resource sharing among the academic libraries. About ten years ago when I was in Colorado we, for example, worked out a plan whereby the university that specialized in agriculture would only buy maybe 80% of the agriculture material while the other schools would not buy much at in agriculture, likewise with the other diciplines like architecture. But the key to making their system work up there, they have a similar on-line system(and I think Sara touched on that in their discussion). I think that's really the key. You can have all the cooperative collection development what have you, but if the people cannot find it, then you need also need a delivery system of some type. So you really need to find a sober driver.

Audience - Rick Tubesing from College of the Southwest in Hobbs, New Mexico. Hobbs is in the southeastern corner of the state, we're very small, we're independent, we're not on-line. We get excellent service from all of you folks through the state library. But I get a little uncomfortable when I fill out the statistics, since we're not on-line, we get nothing borrowed except locally and we've got a good local cooperative system. But we've got two pockets, one good and one outstanding in a sixty thousand volume collection. What role would you see the small private four-year institution playing in the larger sharing of resources?

Jeanne Sohn - I think one of the answers to your specific problem, the fact that you are not on-line and we are talking about institutions that are moving in that direction if they are not already there, is the fact that your collections can still become known as an entity, you say

you have two excellent, one good and one excellent pocket, in terms of those specific collections, there is no reason why every single library in this state can't know about what those areas are and work side by side with you in terms of those things. I mean it may be absolutly beside the point for New Mexico State or for UNM to be developing collections in those areas if what you say is true. For example, Eastern has a superb science fiction collection. New Mexico isn't doing that much in terms of science fiction because we know what they have. Perhaps we know specifically, but we also know generally that science fiction and Eastern kind of go hand in hand, and I think it's important simply from that general point of view as well.

Audience (Rick Tubesing) - Our real strength is the fact that it is, except for Las Cruces, the strongest collection on the Civil War. It happened historically, we have strengthened it over the years. But we have an excellent collection on the United States Civil War, a much stronger than one would expect collection in the southwest, especially locally.

Paul Mosher - I wonder if there isn't also a possible role for the state library, is to help. I should think that making it possible for institutions to share their resources that way would be a reasonable role for them and the state to try and coordinate and strengthen that and even promote legislation that would enable small libraries that can affort that kind of exchange to do so.

Mary Keckley - Would a cooperative cataloging project be feasible, say using the state library where you would either send materials in small batches or photocopy a title page with the relevant information, or shelflist cards and let them imput it into an on-line system?

Sara Heitshu - That's literally how the serials union lists worked in Arizona because a lot of the members now are not OCLC libraries, they don't have terminals but they filled a form and said these are the periodicals that we have and it was all input in Tempe. On the initial project at ASU and continues now in Phoenix at the state library. LSCA funds are part of what backs it up because it does the system state resource sharing.

Audience - I was wondering if the panel, particuarly Dr. Mosher, could talk about the role of, I guess it's out of favor now, but gifts and exchange used to be part of almost any library and my work is in special collections and many of us in regional collections receive two or three or four copies of the same book from donors. One of the concepts could be an actual physical excange of material that would be common in one area but less common in another.

Paul Mosher - Sure, I guess there are a number of uses that can be put and it's up to the individual library to decide on cost and policy, because processing always seems to take a lot of whatever. A number of us use them for exchange purposes with others, some of us use them for trade purposes, sometime they can be sold and other times they are really sent to smaller libraries, which very much have the need of materials in certain areas, which is another form of cooperation, to help bring them up to par in certain areas where they can't afford to do it for themselves. So there are really a number of possibilities there and I think that's a good suggestion. It's a very useful contribution.

Bart Harloe - Is there anyone here from a special library? I was looking in the Bowker Annual to see what acquisitions budgets were in New Mexico and it appears that those special libraries spend more money on acquisitions in New Mexico than the public libraries do, in fact more money than special libraries in Arizona and Colorado do, and I was wondering if any of this makes sense to you.

Audience - I'm Theresa Connaughton from the library at Los Alamos National Laboratory and I do sit here and puzzle over where two national laboratory libraries fit in this mosaic. In the library statistics in New Mexico, Sandia and Los Alamos must be in there, certainly in the top ten, possibly in the top five. We have scientific resources that are possibly unequaled in the southwest and very much in competition with the whole western part of the United States. I don't know. I think there is a spirit of cooperation, but historically we are on networks that are not compatible with the rest of the state. I'm very much puzzled. I think personally that the resources of the national laboratories should be made available to the public in general through cooperative efforts.

Paul Mosher - The national libraries contribute regularly, NAL, NLM, Library of Congress, and so on. It would seem a similar way for the state to work.

Audience (Theresa Connaughton) - Los Alamos does contribute its cataloging to Research Libraries Information Network. We belong to that inter-library loan network. We are automated and we are doing a very heavy retrospective conversion project right now so we should have all of our unclassified holdings completed in a few months.

Paul Mosher - You send it on tape to RLIN?

Audience (Theresa Connaughton) - No, we do it directly. One on one cataloging as a piece comes into our hands.

Bart Harloe - How many RLIN utility libraries are here today that are actually using RLIN as opposed to OCLC, besides Los Alamos?

Audience - My name is Cathy Pasterczyk and I work at Sandia National Laboratories. We do have very strong collections in the sciences and engineering; however, we don't really participate in any networks per se. We use RLIN for descriptive and subject cataloging. We're run in a very different way than Los Alamos. Los Alamos has more of a university atmosphere, we have more of a very large corporate library atmosphere. Maybe to give you some idea, we have 60 staff members, so we're a very large special library. Our collection is very strong in technical reports and we have most of our collection on-line and cataloged in a system called DOBIS, which hasn't been mentioned yet. It's an IBM-based product. The problem with cooperative collection development, at least with Sandia in terms of automated form, is that due to security reasons the classified and unclassified sections of our catalog are all on one computer and security problems will not allow dialup into our computer. Maybe someday we'll break the database down into books and reports and have it actually be two separate sections, but right now that's not possible.

There are some people in Sandia that want to do their on-line searching and the biggest problem is they've never dealt with modums because we don't dial up. Other than the library no one dials outside because we have our own computers, in-house that people use and so in terms of them getting access to information, they're not used to things like that.

Dora Biblarz - Can you afford to buy everything you don't have?

Audience (Cathy Pasterczyk) - No, but we have a very close relationship with the University of New Mexico and UNM essentially serves as our contractor for documents that we don't have. We're very well aware of the strengths that they have and that we don't have. For example, they have a very good patent collection; there's a good business collection; they have a good government documents collection. Those are things we use quite a lot. And so we pay for those services from them.

Audience - Cathy also helped develop the math and computer science and geology collection at UNM. The only thing I would like to add, is what we begin seeing in this kind of thing is a reference network going on when we have a national laboratory. The woman from Los Alamos said we're not on the same networks. I don't think Bob and Jeanne even know this, I didn't mention it to them; but when that virus was going down all of our systems whet down because we are in the electrical engineering part of campus and they came running in and they said that until UNM isolates UNM we're isolating you and they were real nervous because the Computer Center was telling them no, the library cannot go down because the Computer Center does not want to get that reputation. But we do have, we have a reference ability to do networking in that way. We've got some meetings going on in terms of the different labs at UNM to find out how we can cooperate because there are some real barriers there, but I think were talking more of a reference function that interacts with the collection development function.

Paul Mosher - That's something that we didn't talk about but I feel dumb for not mentioning. When we are talking about sharing library resources, then sharing of our human resources is at least as valuable as the sharing of our collecltions. Thank you for mentioning that.

Audience - I'm Ann Armbrister from Amigos. There were a couple of questions a while ago about the RLIN islands in a sea of OCLC users. There are a couple of perhaps adhoc solutions that could be obtained on behalf of the RLIN users or the OCLC users. Amigos does indeed broker for RLIN search services through a special cooperative arrangement with CLASS. We just put that in place last spring and the other option would be, indeed, to tape-load some of the holdings of RLIN users into OCLC and make them available by those means, if that proved to advantageous to the other users.

Hiram Davis - I do not want to be presumptuous and try to speak for this new consortium, but clearly, given the dialogues and discussions we have had, it would be absolutely ludicrous not to recognize that you have two of the strongest national labs in the country and that in fact it's the kind of materials and resources they have that people want access to. It is not the material that has come in on the approval plan that people want to research. I guess that

is the other thing. When you really start talking about this kind of resource sharing and cooperation, is that we spend a lot of time wrestling with. I think the materials that people want access to, we are not even aware that they exist. I think that it is the materials that the people are over researching and some of the labs, developing this information and somehow, I think, we have to try to identify and package that. We have not talked about CD-ROM and other types of products that may help to facil-itate that. But I think that the old game of trying to get money to do some retrospective conversion and all that, I think that day is gone. I really think we need to identify what we talk about with these special collections, and I don't mean special collections in the narrow sense. I really mean those kinds of materials and resources that the labs may have, some other resources that are probably not even processed that we may say have a very low priority, but there may be a group of researchers out there who could really utilize that. I think we have a real dilemma in terms of that balance of how do we identify that material and then how we make it available.

Audience - I would like to follow Dr. Hiram Davis' comment with a question. In thinking about some of the history, some of the historical past and cooperative efforts, it came to my mind, as I was growing up in the library world I was lucky enough to have grown up around people that were involved with SWALC. How many of you remember SWALC? She remembers it. I was just a student when that was going on, and I was involved in cooperative efforts in terms of utilizing federal monies that were made available just to do that. But it is my opinion, and my analysis, that once those monies dried up, the consortium dried up. Is that correct? Ok, maybe I am saying something that I shouldn't say. But my question really is, seeing the need that we have, and that seems to be the motivation behind cooperation; a necessity, right? Monies are drying up, we are seeing tight budgets, so on and so forth. We need to buy more serials, we don't have any more money, we see minus figures rather than positive figures in our accounts. Then we hear mention of people who would like, or should be cooperating with us, such as corporate agencies and also federal government agencies that have holdings that probably the public should be having access to and so forth. The question is, what kind of entities or organizational structures do you see in the future to tie us together in this cooperative effort that our country needs? Because we may be wishing for a lot of cooperation but until we come together, to terms with what kind of structures we are talking about, perhaps we may not be able to do it even though we may need to or wish to. Dr. Mosher, or someone else, would you like to talk about the structures we need to develop?

Paul Mosher - Well you may have them. In that it seems to me that you have Amigos here which was established to do this sort of thing. So far as I can hear from a distance, Amigos does very well at it as a matter of fact. The sense that I get about Amigos that I get from many people that I talk to at the library association meetings, and from the literature is extremely positive. So one of the questions might be, can Amigos serve in this way? There is no reason why it has to be the end all. There may be consortia within the Amigos framework that do certain things. Amigos links them together, but Amigos then may also be able to provide the links to the larger ones outside, or to federal agencies or libraries, in ways that otherwise wouldn't be possible for you. So I suspect the first thing is to pursue some of the tools that you have developed and see if they can do some new things for you.

Audience - I would like to comment on that, if I may. I'm Ed Dowlin from Eastern New Mexico University. I think one of the things we don't do is analyze what has happened in the past to carry this out. You need to recognize I think, is how the political situation has changed in relation to the times. Technically, for example, the business of OCLC going into interlibrary loan and making it possible, has changed the nature of the problem. The problem when I grew up in libraries was to know where something was, so that you could borrow it for somebody. OCLC has made it possible to identify 75% to 95% of the holdings in this country, or the titles let's say, so you can borrow them. The problem is no longer, where to find it but how to get it to the individual or vice versa, one way or the other. That has changed. In the day that I started in this business, the state library was a strong political entity because of the number of requests that were cycling through it in interlibrary loans. They were the ones that tried to find out where things were and where to write and so on. That's become diffused now and we have other agencies. Amigos, for instance, has become, I would say, a political power in the region. I am not saying this in a negative sense, I hope, but the question is where do you go with your problem in terms of the political organization? Amigos, for example, is not structured to deal with the problem of smaller libraries. It started out as contractual for OCLC and required a certain level of funding so that we have some of our junior colleges or two year schools and public libraries that are not part of the OCLC system. I don't think the state libraries are equipped to step into that, so we are left in what I would consider sort of a vacuum. Now I have talked too much, but I wanted to raise that because I think we have a problem of where do we start with organizations to solve the problems that are left now.

Audience - Ann Armbrister (Amigos) - Amigos' mission has been resource sharing within our region and we have undertaken a number of ventures to help bring that about. In regard to interlibrary loans, for example, the interlibrary loan code has been a strong factor in support of interlibrary borrowing among members. But as far as the Amigos structure, I would like to point out some recent changes that have been made in our membership structure that do indeed move away from the focus or the limitation, if you will, of OCLC usage. As an Amigos member you are simply a member of Amigos now and no particular service or product is required in order to hold that status. And we are developing other ventures and services in areas that are not solely focused on OCLC. So for those small libraries that might have looked at OCLC and found that it was not well suited perhaps or more costly than their budgets will allow, let me invite you to look at us again because there may be some other areas that we could work together on. Thank you.

Sara Heitshu - I just want to comment that this business of the smaller libraries is a very real problem in Arizona. Our state library has been looking for a solution and, as far as I know, they have not found one. They are talking about centralized processing agreements. They have talked about buying CD-ROM databases of the MARC records and processing from those. And I think that those things can also be done in cooperation with Amigos to which our state library does belong. So I think the state library does not need to be taken out of the picture just because the politics have changed. I don't know what the attitude is here in New

Mexico. I definitely think the state library should be included in your planning and discussion, because they can be a very real force that draws in a lot of resources from small libraries all over the state. Then again, because of all those topsy/turvy collections, they may have some very unique things out there. Certainly, not scientific things, but other things.

Paul Mosher - They can also act as little CLRs, that is help find funding for small libraries that really haven't the resources to go out and shake the trees for the kinds of things they need. A state library, I think, does have that capacity and many of them work that way.

Audience - I'm Virginia Hendley, I'm the State Librarian. I thought I was going to sit through a nice calm meeting, and I was going to sit back there. I was sort of skulking back on the back row. I grapple with the problem of small libraries on a daily basis. We currently have a task force that was put in place by Karen Watkins, who is New Mexico Library Association President this year. That task force is looking at what started out to be the concept of a state-wide database, which is what I have heard for five years that people in New Mexico want. We are getting some excellent input on that and many of the things that you mentioned today are coming out from the task force and what they are discussing. The idea of providing access, I think, is taking preference to the database as an entity. We are looking at expanding access rather than just creating a database for its own sake. The problem that Dr. Tubesing mentioned, excellent collections which exist but because of technology we have no access to, are some of the things that we are hoping to come to terms with.

Audience - David Null, from the University of New Mexico. I would like to pursue a little bit of that question that we have all sort of been touching on, but haven't really dealt much with, which is the question of physical access and delivery systems which I keep hearing everyone saying. One of the things that has always bothered me about cooperation, particularly interstate cooperation in this region, is just the physical distances. If you are at ASU or U of A, you are two hours drive apart, or UTEP and NMSU, which is a one hour drive apart; but if I'm in Albuquerque and I have to tell a faculty member or a graduate student, we don't collect in that area but they have a wonderful collection in Arizona, you can hop in your car and be there in nine hours. They don't get real thrilled about that. So what do you think the prospects really are for some type of document delivery system better than what we have now. A delivery system, particularly interstate, not just intra-state. We all know about the bullet train they are going to build in New Mexico.

Sara Heitshu - I don't know, but you have touched on the thing that has bothered me ever since I moved to the Southwest. I came from an area in Michigan where it was no more than an hour and a half from one major research library to another and all three were in one corner of the state. Now, I come out here and it is two hours to ASU and that is the closest, and as Don says you have to find a driver that wants to stay sober. But I don't know what the answer is. Dora, was it you who was telling the story about in Australia, about putting the books on the laundry trucks among Health Science Libraries because they were connected with hospitals. The truck did all the deliveries, we need something like that.

Paul Mosher - Some of you are talking about FAX. And I know one of the things that I have enjoyed in going to Pennsylvania is that the state library and the academic institutions and some public libraries in Pennsylvania got together and persuaded the legislature to provide money for FAX machines for participating members. There is a very active journal exchange and we've talked about journals as being perhaps the most crucial of those areas. That works and everybody generally understands that it provides more to the have-not's than to the haves who participate. Nobody seems to spend their time worrying about it. The volume is not enough to bring anybody down. I'm hardly going to stop it, though we tend to lend more than others. There are net benefits we get in return, among other things, the fax machine that we use to send those to other libraries in the state. So I think there are a number of possibilities, and part of it is parsing out what part of it you need to handle first. Maybe it is handleable by your state, certainly something like that I think is. I think Illinois has some similar mechanism.

Hiram Davis - Well you know Paul, I think we're missing the boat here because when we talked about document delivery there's alot of talk in the state about economic development. I was at UCLA, which still has a very excellent van service, and what they discoverd is that you're not just moving books, but you're also moving people. And so if you want to go to San Francisco or you want to go down to San Diego and shop for the day, you just get on the van, take a few books with you and drop them off.

Audience - At the University of Toledo they set up a van service along with the sister school, Bowling Green, about 60 miles away. That's what did make the van pay. It was a nominal fee but it made the trip back and forth. And those people who wanted to do research or wanted to look at the journals, not simply go for an index or an abstract, and get same-day return-delivery could go down there for the day.

Jeanne Sohn - There is one other point, and I think there are people who are better qualified than myself to speak on this. We at UNM are in the process of testing a variety of FAX machines. Our recommendation will be viewed by the other academic libraries in the state and a decision on which machine to purchase will be made at that point.

Audience - Juan Sandoval, UTEP Library. It is very, very noble that everyone gets together and they want to foster cooperative agreements, but what happens once we have personnel changes? So a very, very altruistic group gets together. They have all decided that one university will collect in one area, one in another, and then that person sees a job ad and gets a better job somewhere else. Who is going to follow through with that commitment? What about the institutions and who will remember that one institution is presumably collecting in one area? Everyone else has assumed that they are continuing to do so. How do we foster communication? I envision in the future a lot of unfilled interlibrary loan requests just going back and forth all over the country.

Paul Mosher - I think we should make him answer his own question. Well, I don't think altruism should determine it. I think that enlightened self-interest should. I think that those libraries who have had the best luck with cooperative ventures are those who have really

tried to work out what is really in their institutional best interest and where they have demonstrated a long-term commitment. They also have to recognize that things change andwithin the RLG group that is built into the understanding that there will be changes. Another thing within RLG one seldom talks about a single institution that only in very rare instances has a primary collecting responsibility. Rather, it is a group of three of four institutions or even five that then talk about how they will handle that among them. Recognizing that no one can keep an institution over time specializing in something if its faculty leave. In terms of how you handle the libraries themselves or the librarians, that is what your policy is supposed to help do - serve as your institutional memory. So that the new librarian coming in can review what was the policy and then of course there may need to be discussions again if there are enough changes within the new community. So that it is revivified in terms of what it is doing and it may well want to change the policy; great, good that has to do with the changing nature of human societies and the changing needs of their institutions. But, I think to build change in is the point you are making and I think it is a very important issue.

Audience - I have a comment that I think relates to some of the things that have been said. It reminds me of someone asking me at the reference desk in the Arizona collection. They wanted a list of Arizona businesses and they wanted to know if there had been a directory and I said, "did you try the phone book?" They said "yes, that is a great idea." I think one of the things that this brings out is we need in many ways to think about simplifying and getting to the basics. I think the point of OCLC is that something will work if it is simple and makes sense. And sometimes in terms of how we keep these agreements is making them so simple that they are fail-safe or as fail-safe as possible. And possibly also going back to the basics of what librarianship used to be. Some of the things that used to work still work now but they are called something different. Collection development used to be called something else. In archives it is now called documentation strategy which is just another thing that has gone funny. So, I think that one of the points is the need for simplification and making some- thing so simple that it makes sense to people and they can understand and they are more likely to remember it regardless of what staff is there at one point or the other.

Audience - I am Ann Schultis from UTEP. I have a very practical question for you New Mexico folks. What plans are there at the state level for a state-wide union list of serials for the state of New Mexico? I commend the Arizonians for SOAR, and we use it all of the time. If you need anecdotal evidence for your ILL going up, we use AZS and AZU and Northern considerably because we can very easily on-line document what they have got. We do use New Mexico State's serials list and also UNM. We have their lists on fiche, but a statewide list would probably be of use to people outside the region in Arizona and other parts of Texas.

Audience - Virginia Hendley. I mentioned the task force earlier. This is one of the suggestions that they are making to me that we consider a statewide union serials list.

Audience - Virginia, is that an NMLA task force? Yes.

Audience - Don Riggs, Dean of Libraries at Arizona State University. My comments this time on a more serious note. In many of our libraries, 40 percent of our collections have not been reflected in our card catalogs and I know at ASU in our online catalog we are going to put a lot of subsets of our database in. For example, a map collection, manuscripts, all these different types of documents and I think this is just a terrific thing for our scholarship. In the past you really never had any records of these types of items, but just in our manuscript collections and our materials on the Southwest, for example, all those things are reflected. Some of you have much stronger collections than ASU, but when those are reflected in our online catalogs, then we have the linking system among the different catalogs. I think this is going to be a tremendous asset to scholarship.

Bart Harloe - Any more questions. I see people edging towards the door. We can reconvene this meeting at pool-side where there will be some wine, cheese, hors d'oeuvres, and things of that sort and continue some of these discussions. Thank you very much for coming and thanks for participating so well in this workshop. Thanks to our panelists, also, for being here and making a very valuable contribution.

TOWARDS THE YEAR 2001

Speaker Biographical Information
(Professional Experience)

Dr. Paul Mosher

Vice Provost and Director of Libraries, University of Pennsylvania, 1988 to present.

Deputy Director, Stanford University Libraries, 1985-1988.

Director of Research Services, Stanford University Libraries, 1984-1985.

Director of Collection Development, Stanford University Libraries, 1979-1984.

Assistant Director of Collection Development, Stanford University Libraries, 1975-1979.

Jeanne Sohn

Associate Dean of Library Services, University of New Mexico, 1986 to present.

Assistant Dean for Collection Development, University of New Mexico, 1981-1986.

Chief of Collection Development, Temple University Libraries, 1975-1981.

Literature and Communications Bibliographer, Temple University Libraries, 1971-1975.

Assistant to the Curator, Rare Book Dept., Temple University Libraries, 1969-1970.

Dora Biblarz

Associate Dean for Collection Development, Arizona State University, 1984 to present.

Head, Collection and Acquisition Services, Arizona State University, 1980-1984.

Acting Assistant Dean for Library Collections, University of New Mexico, 1979-1980.

Head Acquisitions Librarian, UNM, 1978.

Assistant Head of Acquisitions, University of California-Davis, 1976-1978.

Acquisitions Librarian, University of California-Davis, 1972-1976.

Sara Heitshu

Assistant University Librarian for Technical Services, University of Arizona, 1984 to present.

Head of Serials Department, University of Michigan, 1979-1984.

Assistant Head of the Acquisitions Department, University of Michigan, 1973-1978.

Bibliographic Searcher, University of Michigan, 1971-1973.

Mary Keckley

Associate University Librarian, University of Texas at El Paso, 1987 to present.

Library Automation Coordinator, University of Texas at El Paso, 1985-1987.

Head, Serials Department, University of Texas at El Paso, 1980-1987.

Head, Cataloging Processing Section, University of Texas at El Paso, 1974-1980.

APPENDIX A

TOWARD THE YEAR 2001:
Workshop participants

Ann Armbrister
AMIGOS Bibliographic Council
Dallas, TX 75243

Helen M. Barber
New Mexico State University
Las Cruces, NM 88003

Judith R. Bernstein
University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, NM 87137

Dora Biblarz
Arizona State University
Tempe, AZ 85287

Linda Blazer
New Mexico State University
Las Cruces, NM 88003

Carol Boyse
New Mexico State University
Las Cruces, NM 88003

Cesar Caballero
University of Texas at El Paso
El Paso, TX 79968

Laura Chen
New Mexico State University
Las Cruces, NM 88003

Eileen Cohn
University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, NM 87131

Joanne Colley
University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, NM 87131

TOWARD THE YEAR 2001:
Workshop Participants

Theresa Connaughton
Los Alamos National Laboratories
Los Alamos, NM 87545

Hiram Davis
New Mexico State University
Las Cruces, NM 88003

Phyllis Dillard
Dona Ana Branch Community College
Las Cruces, NM 88003

C. Edwin Dowlin
Eastern New Mexico University
Portales, NM 88130

Lowell Duhrsen
New Mexico State University
Las Cruces, NM 88003

Jon Eldredge
University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, NM 87131

John Freyermuth
New Mexico State University
Las Cruces, NM 88003

Bart Harloe
New Mexico State University
Las Cruces, NM 88003

Virginia Hendley
New Mexico State Library
Santa Fe, NM 87503

Patsy Hernandez
New Mexico State University
Las Cruces, NM 88003

Sara Heitshu
University of Arizona Library
Tucson, AZ 85721

TOWARD THE YEAR 2001:
Workshop Participants

Austin Hoover
New Mexico State University
Las Cruces, NM 88003

Valerie Horton
New Mexico State University
Las Cruces, NM 88003

Carol Joiner
University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, NM 87131

Mary Keckley
University Of Texas at El Paso
El Paso, TX 79968

Betsy Kraus
New Mexico Institute of Mining & Technology
Socorro, NM 87801

David Larkin
University of Texas at El Paso
El Paso, TX 79968

Linda Lewis
University of New Mexico
Albquerque, NM 87131

Harry Llull
University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, NM 87131

Lynn Llull-Kaczor
Sandia National Laboratories
Albuquerque, NM 87185

Fran Martinez
New Mexico State University
Las Cruces, NM 88003

TOWARD THE YEAR 2001:
Workshop Participants

Robert Migneault
University of new Mexico
Albuquerque, NM 87131

Anne Morgan
New Mexico State University
Las Cruces, NM 88003

Paul Mosher
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PA 19104-6206

Carolyn Mountain
University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, NM 87131

David Null
University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, NM 871131

Susan Oberlander
Northern New Mexico Community Collge
Espanola, NM 87532

Ed Oetting
Arizona State University
Tempe, AZ 87287-1006

Cathy Pasterczyk
Sandia National Laboratories
Albuquerque, NM 87185

Jenny Rayson
New Mexico State University
Las Cruces, NM 88003

Betty Reynolds
New Mexico Institute of Mining & Technology
Socorro, NM 87801

TOWARD THE YEAR 2001:
Workshop Participants

Don Riggs
Arizona State University
Tempe, AZ 85287

Antonio Rodarte
University of Texas at El Paso
El Paso, TX 79968

Stanley Ruckman
New Mexico State University at Alamogordo
Alamogordo, NM 88311-0477

Juan Sandoval
University of Texas at El Paso
El Paso, TX 79968-0582

Ann Schultis
University of Texas at El Paso
El Paso, TX 79968-0582

Jeanette C. Smith
New Mexico State University
Las Cruces, NM 88003

Jeanne Sohn
University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, NM 87131

Kathy Sowa
New Mexico State University
Las Cruces, NM 88003

Karen Stabler
New Mexico State University
Las Cruces, NM 88003

Emily Terrell
University of New Mexico
Tijeras, NM 87059

TOWARD THE YEAR 2001:
Workshop Participants

Richard Tubesing
College of the Southwest
Hobbs, NM 88240

Ben Wakashige
Western New Mexico University
Silver City, NM 88061

Bonnie Wetzel
New Mexico State University
Las Cruces, NM 88003

Gayle Williams
University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, NM 87131

Cheryl Wilson
New Mexico State University
Las Cruces, NM 88003

Cindy Wold
University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, NM 87131

Jeannette Woodward
College of Santa Fe
Santa Fe, NM 87501